DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 736 UD 007 412

Report of In-Service Institute for Selected Professional Personnel of Three School Districts: El Dorado, Smackover and Sparkman Concerning Problems of School Desegregation.

Henderson State Coll., Arkadelphia, Ark.; Ouachita Bapist Univ., Arkadelphia, Ark.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

Pub Date 30 May 68

Contract-OEC-4-7-000284-3153

Note-72p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.70

Descriptors-Boards of Education, *Changing Attitudes, Community Leaders, Counselors, *Inservice Programs, *Institutes (Training Programs), Principals, *Professional Personnel, Program Evaluation, *School Integration, Teachers

Identifiers-Arkansas, El Dorado, Smackover, Sparkman

The objective of the three phases of this institute was to change the attitudes of the participating school administrators, school board members, community leaders, counselors, and teachers so that they would be willing to accept responsibility for dealing with the problems of school desegregation in their respective school districts. Phase I brought the participants together for a series of lectures and seminars. Phase II was a 3-week period of intensive study of the background of school desegregation plans and programs; Phase III was a followup period and took place in the participants' schools. Both the evidence of observers and the judgment of the participants subscribe to the effectiveness of the program. (EF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

07412 E

ERIC

ED0 24736

REPORT OF

In-Service Institute for Selected Professional Personnel of Three School Districts: El Dorado, Smackover and Sparkman Concerning Problems of School Desegregation

INSTITUTE DIRECTOR:
Dr. A. B. Wetherington, Professor of Education
Ouachita Baptist University

ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR:
Dr. C. M. Strack, Dean General College
Henderson State College

ASSISTANT DIRECTORS:
Mr. Hugh Watson, Principal
Fairview Elementary School, El Dorado, Arkansas

Mr. Joe Garr, Teacher
Arkansas Training School, Sparkman, Arkansas

Contract No. OEC 4-7-000284-3153
Public Law 88-352, Title IV, Section 404
The Civil Rights Act of 1964

Institute Conducted Jointly By
OUACHITA BAPTIST UNIVERSITY
and
HENDERSON STATE COLLEGE
of
Arkadelphia, Arkansas

The Institute Reported Herein Was Performed Pursuant
to a Contract with the
U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare

May 30, 1968

UD 007 412

ABSTRACT

Title IV Institute Contract No. OEC-4-7-000284-3153

A special Training Institute for School Administrators, School Board Members, selected Community Leaders, and Teachers concerning problems incident to school desegregation in El Dorado, Smackover, and Sparkman School Districts.

Institute Staff:

Director - Dr. A. B. Wetherington, Professor of Education, Ouachita University
Associate Director - Dr. C. M. Strack, Dean General College, Henderson State College
Assistant Directors - Mr. Hugh Watson, Principal, Fairview Elementary School, El Dorado; and Mr. Joe Garr, Teacher, Arkansas Training School, Sparkman, Arkansas
Staff Consultants - Dr. Waldo Dahlstedt, Professor of Education, Henderson State College
Mrs. Juanita Sandford, Instructor in Sociology, Ouachita University
Consultants - Phase I - 14; Phase III - 9
Detailed information concerning consultants follows.

Contractor: Ouachita Baptist University and Henderson State College. The Institute was funded through Ouachita University, but the endeavor was a cooperative effort on the part of administrations and staff personnel of both institutions.

The Institute reported herein was conducted pursuant to a contract with the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education.

Dates:
Phase I - April 10 - May 27, 1967
Phase II - May 29 - August 31, 1967
Phase III - September 1, 1967 - May 30, 1968

The training phase was divided into two stages. The first during April - May, 1967, when four sessions took place for staff and participants. These meetings were held at Camden, Arkansas, for 60 leadership personnel. The second stage, Phase II met in Arkadelphia, Arkansas, on the HSC campus from June 12 to June 30. Sixty-four participants were enrolled.

The third, or follow-through phase of the Institute involved 9 sessions through the 1967-68 school year. Three general sessions for all participants at El Dorado and 6 sessions in each of the local school communities of El Dorado, Smackover, and Sparkman.

The program of the Institute took place as presented in the full report. Participants are grouped in following tables by phases. Staff, consultants, content, etc., are reported for each of the three phases in full report.

The following tables indicate the school systems involved, the proportion of Negro and White persons, and school assignment.

Racial Composition

School System	Phase I Negro	Phase I White	Phase I Total	Phase II Negro	Phase II White	Phase II Total	Phase III Negro	Phase III White	Phase III Total
Camden	3	6	9	-	-	-	-	-	- *
El Dorado	9	18	27	12	16	28	18	22	40
Harmony Grove	1	4	5	-	-	-	-	-	- *
Smackover	1	8	9	3	15	18	3	15	18
Sparkman	3	7	10	9	9	18	9	9	18
Total	17	43	60	24	40	64	30	46	76

* These two school districts were involved only in Phase I of the Institute.

School Assignments

	Phase I	Phase II	Phase III
Supervisors----------------	3	0	0
Superintendents------------	4	0	2 **
Principals-----------------	24	4	5
Counselors-----------------	3	2	2
School Board Members-------	3	0	0
Elementary Teachers--------	8	33	40
Secondary Teachers---------	7	20	21
Special Teachers----------- (Remedial Librarians)	5	4	5
Community Representatives--	3	1	1
Total	60	64	76

** Mr. Tommey, Superintendent of El Dorado, attended most of the Institu sessions. He was not enrolled as a participant.
The superintendents at Smackover and Sparkman were enrolled as participants.

OVERVIEW OF INSTITUTE PROGRAMS

An analysis of the above table can be summarized as follows:

Phase I, 60 (43 White, 17 Negro) from Sparkman, El Dorado, Smackove Camden, Harmony Grove; Phase II, 64 (40 White, 24 Negro) from Sparkman, El Dorado, and Smackover; Phase III, 76 (46 White, 30 Negro) representin the same schools as in Phase II. School assignments represented include superintendents, school board members, principals, librarians, counselor and teachers at all levels.

The broad objective of the Institute was stated as follows: "The over-all objective of the three phases is to challenge and assist participants to develop understandings and attitudes that will motivate them to voluntarily accept or assume responsibilities concerning problems incident to school desegregation."

Program procedures were constituted in the following ways. The initial phase (Phase I) brought consultants, the staff, school district and community leaders together for a conference series. During this phase the general status and nature of integrated education was reviewed with the local conditions and potentials being assessed. Special needs for Phase II were considered. An evaluation was made of the potential of each school faculty.

Phase I consultants were: Dr. Lawrence Davis, President, A.M. & N. College; Mr. Darl Hulit, Title IV, OEEO; Mr. Waite Madison, Title IV, OEEO; Dr. Frank L. Stanley, National Urban League. Small group seminars enabled all participants to contribute to the exchange and the plans involved. The topics focused upon included the "Guideline's" intents and demands, the educational goals involved, the resources available for community growth in desegregation.

Phase II was an intensive study period, three weeks, during which the participants examined in depth the backgrounds, attitudes, new ideas for education, school plans and individual programs related to desegregation. Eleven lecturers and consultants contributed to the sessions. Participants engaged in seminar study, reading and reports, school status analysis, individual plan reports, and attitude surveys.

The follow-up (Phase III) occurred in the respective schools, occasionally in combination. The staff and consultants were able to focus upon specific developments and plans of the schools and reinforce through group and individual conference, the work of faculty members in each school district.

The atmosphere for integration became much clearer for all participants as a result of the Institute program. Individuals were able to work more effectively as teachers in the classroom and as teachers engaged in faculty groups. Assessments made of team potentials and of individual attitudes indicated clear advancement when early and later results were compared. Program evaluations evidence consistently favorable responses from participants. Their confidence and performance were enhanced. Community leaders, when present, had an appreciated opportunity to exchange views in a favorable atmosphere which was often absent on other community occasions. The Institute made available a vehicle through which an extended involvement of the local population could begin.

Not all schedules worked as visualized; hot weather was irritating some participants had to interrupt attendance; feelings were stirred; but there were important ideas exchanged, plans evolved and efforts continued.

Both evidence and the judgment of participants subscribe to the effectiveness of the program in the school districts concerned. Furthermore, progress in these schools has given nearby interested observers real example and encouragement to move ahead.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Summary Analysis of Institute Program 3a

Participants - Each Phase 4

Institute Staff and Consultants 10

Content - Phase I 15

Phase II 18

Methods 27

Teaching Aids 27

Consultation and Guidance 28

Informal Program 28

Facilities 28

Evaluation 30

Follow-Through Phase III 43

Appendix 55

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF INSTITUTE PROGRAM

The Institute program was conducted jointly by Ouachita University and Henderson State College. The program was planned and conducted in three phases:

Phase I involved 60 school administrators, school board members and community leaders, and selected teachers from six school districts. This phase of the program opened a few doors and local administrators began to do some thinking and planning to meet the problems of school desegregation as goals to be achieved in providing improved education for all children and youth.

Phase II involved 65 teachers and principals from three school systems - El Dorado, Smackover, and Sparkman - a three weeks (15 days) Institute was conducted on the Henderson State College campus. Three major themes were considered in the program. These are stated in Content of Phase II.

Phase III was the follow-through program. Nine 5-hour Institute sessions were conducted - three general meetings for all three school districts and 6 local sessions in each of the three districts - El Dorado, Smackover and Sparkman. All three general sessions were held at El Dorado. An integral part of the follow-through was school visits by staff members. These proved very helpful and were welcomed. Consultants participated in these visits.

Over all Evaluation is difficult because of the time span in activities. Some observations are:

1. It is difficult to be selective of participants for three weeks on-campus Institutes. It seems that Institutes at local schools have some advantages.
2. A two weeks carefully planned on-campus Institute may achieve about as much as a three-weeks program.
3. The experiences of the Institute have had a very positive impact on the three school communities involved--Smackover is now organized as a single school program; Sparkman has passed, after the second try during the Institute, a bond issue to build a new school plant to accommodate grades 7-12 of both races; El Dorado has moved forward in several areas in spite of some community problems. The power structure seems to be moving in a positive direction toward alleviating problems incident to desegregation.

Future needs are in the area of technical assistance for school administration and in-service education.

3. DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTE PROGRAM

a - List of Participants

Phase I

Participant Name	Address	Title
CAMDEN SCHOOL SYSTEM		
Cole, Mrs. Willa Bea	P. O. Box 51	Elementary Principal
Donaldson, Mr. Jerome L.	345 Grinstead	Elementary Principal
Elliott, Mr. Wyley J.	737 Jefferson Dr.	Superintendent
Garrison. Mr. Vernon C.	2107 Maul Road	Elementary Principal
Ivory, Mr. George S.	783 Lincoln Dr.	High School Principal
Moseley, Mrs. Charles	745 McCullough	Librarian - Principal
Redding, Mrs. Sam	440 Clifton	Elementary Principal
Seymour, Mr. F. F.	514 Elaine	High School Principal
Williams, Mr. John C., Jr.	737 Jefferson Dr.	Director of Federal Program 5
EL DORADO SCHOOL SYSTEM		
Austin, Mr. Pel	1315 Crestwood	Counselor
Beasley, Mr. Leroy		School Board Member
Cammack, Mr. James W.	930 Kenwood Dr.	Jr. High Principal
Daniel, Mr. A. J.	708 Cherry	Elementary Principal
Doss, Mr. Garland	P. O. Box 1527	Principal
Gass, Mrs. Helen Ruth	2307 Ripley	Elementary Principal
Green, Mrs. Virginia M.	912 Ouachita	Counselor
Hampton, Mrs. Audrey	Route 1, Box 263	Elementary Principal
Harris, Mrs. Miriam	211 N. Holloway	Principal
Humphreys, Mrs. Bettie	504 W. Main	Elementary Teacher
Jamerson, Mrs. Lula Mae	1227 E. Burns	Community Representative
Johnson, Mr. Eugene	Northwest Elem.	Principal
Lovett, Mr. Roy H.	1218 E. Cook	Principal
Muldrew, Mr. Winston J.	715 Cherry	Principal
Porterfield, Mr. Paul	504 N. Newton	Elementary Principal
Powell, Mrs. Thelma	1100 Ouachita	Community Representative
Riley, Mr. James N.	1115 W. Hillsboro	Coordinator
Ross, Mr. Bobby D.	1212 Norsworthy	Secondary Teacher - Social S.
Smith, Mr. Harold E.	501 Timberland Dr.	High School Principal
Smith, Mrs. Harold E.	1215 W. Block	Elementary Principal
Tommey, Mr. W. D.	1115 W. Hillsboro	Superintendent
Wasson, Mr. James D.	420 Clarmont	Jr. High Principal
Williams, Mr. M. L.	614 S. Quaker	Assistant Principal
Williamson, Mr. Horace	Union Co. Courthouse	County Supervisor
Williamson, Mrs. Mildred		Counselor
Wilson, Mrs. Letha	1408 W. Block	Elementary Principal
Young, Mr. Harvey L.	2420 W. Hillsboro	Director of Instruction

Participant Name	Address	Title

HARMONY GROVE SCHOOL SYSTEM

Caviness, Mrs. Azalea M.	513 Criss Street	Reading Teacher
Nash, Mr. W. P.	Route 3, Box 217	Superintendent
Odell, Mr. Myron	P. O. Box 91	School Board Member
Turner, Mr. T. G.	Route 3, Box 217	High School Principal
Wagnon, Mr. Felton	Route 4, Box 60	School Board Member

SMACKOVER SCHOOL SYSTEM

Alphin, Mrs. Don	Route 4, Box 219a	Elementary Teacher
Burke, Mr. Doyle K.	Box 425	Secondary Principal
Burke, Mrs. Doyle K.	Box 425	Special Education Teacher
Daniel, Mrs. Orlis	607 E. 12th	Elementary Teacher
Gardner, Mr. Lewis	Box 123	Elementary Principal
Hunt, Miss Marie	Box 345	Elementary Teacher
Sledge, Miss Mary	Box 8	Secondary Teacher - Home Ec.
Smeltzer, Mr. Donald	104 W. 13th	Secondary Teacher - English
Tomlinson, Mr. Randle	Box 783	Secondary Teacher - Bus. Ed.

SPARKMAN SCHOOL SYSTEM

Brett, Mrs. Aurelia H.	Sparkman, Ark.	Secondary Teacher - Science
Brown, Mr. Howard Lee	Box 66	Secondary Teacher - Coach
Frazier, Mr. Marvin	Box 37	Superintendent
Gallagher, Mrs. Emma J.	Box 264	Remedial Reading Teacher
Gatling, Mrs. R. E.	Box 74	Elementary Teacher
Green, Mrs. R. M.	Sparkman, Ark.	Teacher
Jones, Mr. Floyd O.	Box 195	Secondary Teacher
Key, Mrs. Vera Mae	Sparkman, Ark.	Elementary Teacher
Scott, Miss Vera A.	Box 264	Elementary Teacher
Wesley, Mrs. Theoda	Route 1, Box 121	Community Representative

Phase II

Three-Week Summer Institute

Alphin, Mrs. Don	Rt. 4, Box 219a Smackover, Ark.	Elementary Teacher
Anthony, Miss Betty	424 E. Ross, Prescott, Ark.	Home Economics Teacher
Baker, Mrs. Ina	400 E. McNeil Magnolia	Counselor
Baskin, Miss Joan	1123 S. W. Avenue El Dorado	Elementary Teacher
Brett, Mrs. Aurelia H.	Sparkman, Ark.	Secondary Teacher - Science, Biology, W. History
Brown, Mr. Howard	P.O. Box 732 Grambling, La.	Ninth Grade Science, P.E.
Cameron,Mrs. A. H.	P.O. Box 81 Smackover	English, Spanish Teacher

Participant Name	Address	Title
Carlton, Mrs. Sara N.	1002 W. Faulkner El Dorado	Elementary Teacher
Charles, Mrs. Juanita K.	921 Union Ave. El Dorado	Elementary Teacher
Daniel, Mr. A. J.	708 Cherry El Dorado	Elementary Principal
Daniel, Mrs. Orlis B.	607 E. 12th Smackover	Elementary Teacher
Deere, Mrs. Carl	P. O. Box 155 Sparkman	Elementary Teacher
Deere, Mrs. R. R.	302 West 7th Smackover	Elementary Teacher
Ferguson, Mrs. Girtie	P. O. Box 144 Sparkman	Elementary Teacher
Fore, Mrs. Stella H.	106 Oakhurst El Dorado	Jr. High - American Hist.
Franklin, Mrs. Julia M.	515 Kinard El Dorado	Teacher
Freppon, Mr. Wayne	P. O. Box 475 Smackover	Coach & Secondary Teacher
Fry, Mrs. Glenda Carolyn	2504 Pine Arkadelphia	Secondary - Business
Gallagher, Mrs. Emma J.	P. O. Box 264 Sparkman	Elementary Teacher
Garlington, Mr. James H.	P. O. Box 194 Sparkman	High School Coach
Garn, Mr. Joe L.	Route 3, Box 228 Ruston, La.	Secondary - Soc. Studies
Gaston, Mrs. Elby Dalton	Sparkman	Librarian
Gatling, Mrs. R. E.	P. O. Box 74 Sparkman	Elementary Teacher
Goodwin, Mrs. Lucy	1529 N. Roselawn El Dorado	Elementary Teacher
Green, Mrs. Helen F.	P. O. Box 214 Sparkman	Secondary - English
Henley, Mr. Francis C.	P. O. Box 123 Norphlet	Elementary Teacher
Hicks, Mrs. Gladys M.	P. O. Box 591 Smackover	Elementary Teacher
Humphreys, Mrs. Bettie	504 W. Main El Dorado	Elementary Teacher
Hunt, Miss Marie	P. O. Box 345 Smackover	Elementary Teacher
Jones, Mr. Floyd O.	P. O. Box 195 Thornton	Secondary - Gov., Health, Sci., Math, Spelling
Lemley, Mr. James W.	P. O. Box 475 Smackover	Coach, Math Teacher
Lovett, Mr. Roy H.	1218 E. Cook El Dorado	Elementary Principal
Lynn, Miss Vyrene	1226 N. Y. El Dorado	Elementary Teacher

Participant Name	Address	Title
McClain, Mrs. R. L.	Route 1, Box 28 Smackover	Elementary Teacher
McCollum, Mrs. Melle	109 Lion El Dorado	Elementary Teacher
McWilliams, Mrs. Burnice	609 E. 12th Smackover	Elementary Teacher
Mann, Mrs. Julia E.	1000 W. 7th El Dorado	Elementary Teacher
Meekins, Mr. Franklin	Route 1, Box 49 Smackover	Elementary Principal
Meekins, Mrs. Lois	Route 1, Box 49 Smackover	Elementary Teacher
Moore, Mrs. Koma	253 E. Grinstead Camden	Librarian
Muldrew, Mr. Winston	715 Cherry El Dorado	High School Principal
Norris, Mrs. Edith	3208 Edgewood El Dorado	Elementary Teacher
Olive, Mrs. Frank	508 E. 13th Smackover	Secondary - Eng., Languages
Porterfield, Mr. Paul	504 N. Newton El Dorado	Elementary Principal
Powell, Mrs. Thelma	1100 Ouachita El Dorado	Community Leader
Robertson, Mrs. Nellie	1121 S. West El Dorado	Elementary Teacher
Robins, Mr. B. F.	1305 Poplar Smackover	Counselor
Ross, Mrs. Chester	2104 Helena El Dorado	Librarian
Ross, Mr. David C.	1025 East 1st El Dorado	Secondary - English
Rowland, Miss Mary	422 W. Cedar El Dorado	Elementary Teacher
Ruffin, Mrs. Jewel	1205 Hillsboro El Dorado	Remedial Reading
Scott, Miss Vera	1213 Maul Rd. Camden	Elementary Teacher
Seale, Mrs. Sammy	P. O. Box 216 Sparkman	Secondary - Sci., Home Ec.
Sims, Mrs. Ella	P. O. Box 967 El Dorado	Secondary - Business
Sledge, Miss Mary	P. O. Box 8 Smackover	Secondary - Home Ec. Jr. High - English
Stocks, Mr. J. T.	408 W. 7th Smackover	Secondary - Eng., Math
Stocks, Mrs. J. T.	408 W. 7th Smackover	Primary Teacher
Taylor, Mrs. Phil H.	P. O. Box 6 Sparkman	Elementary Teacher
Vernon, Mrs. Clara Mae	1214 W. Block El Dorado	Elementary Teacher

Participant Name	Address	Title
Walker, Mrs. Bobbie Gean	Route 1, Box 102 Sparkman	Elementary Teacher
White, Mr. Gascyl R.	2504 Nevada El Dorado	Elementary Teacher
Wood, Mr. A. B.	708 Magnolia Smackover	Secondary - Coach
Yates, Mrs. Henryetta	1007 Van El Dorado	Secondary - Study Hall
Young, Mrs. Jeane L.	P. O. Box 3 Louann, Ark.	Elementary Teacher

Phase III
Follow-Through Program

Participant Name	Title
SMACKOVER SCHOOL SYSTEM	
Alphin, Mrs. Don	Elementary Teacher
Daniel, Mrs. Orlis B.	Elementary Teacher
Deere, Mrs. R. R.	Elementary Teacher
Head, Mrs. R. T.	Elementary Teacher
Hicks, Mrs. Gladys M.	Elementary Teacher
Hunt, Miss Marie	Elementary Teacher
McWilliams, Mrs. Burnice T.	Elementary Teacher
Olive, Mrs. Frank	Secondary - English, Languages
Robins, Mr. B. F.	Counselor
Sledge, Miss Mary	Secondary - Home Ec.
Smeltzer, Mr. Donald	Jr. High - English
Stocks, Mr. J. T.	Secondary - English
Stocks, Mrs. J. T.	Secondary - English, Math
Weaver, Mr. Larry	Primary Teacher
Weaver, Mrs. Jean	Superintendent
Young, Mrs. Jeane L.	Physical Education
Dodson, Mr. Jerrell	Elementary Teacher
	Coach
SPARKMAN SCHOOL SYSTEM	
Anthony, Miss Betty	Home Economics Teacher
Bateman, Mr. William	Secondary Teacher
Brett, Mrs. Aurelia H.	Secondary - Sci., Biology, W. History
Deere, Mrs. Carl	Elementary Teacher
Ferguson, Mrs. Girtie	Elementary Teacher
Frazier, Mr. Marvin	Superintendent
Garlington, Mr. James H.	High School Coach
Gaston, Mrs. Elby Dalton	Librarian
Gatling, Mrs. R. E.	Elementary Teacher
Giles, Mrs. E.	Elementary Teacher
Green, Mrs. Helen Frances	Secondary - English
Jones, Mr. Floyd O.	Secondary - Govt., Health, Science, Math, Spelling

Participant Name	Title
SPARKMAN SCHOOL SYSTEM (continued)	
Moore, Mrs. Koma Victoria	Librarian
Phillips, Lilia Grace	Elementary Teacher
Seale, Mrs. Sammy	Secondary - Science, Home Economics
Taylor, Mrs. Phil H.	Elementary Teacher
Walker, Mrs. Bobbie Gean	Elementary Teacher
Williamson, Mr. King S.	Music Teacher
EL DORADO SCHOOL SYSTEM	
Baker, Mrs. Ina	Counselor
Baskin, Miss Joan	Elementary Teacher
Charles, Mrs. Juanita K.	Elementary Teacher
Daniel, Mr. A.J.	Elementary Principal
Franklin, Mrs. Julia M.	Teacher
Gass, Mrs. Helen	Elementary Principal
Goodwin, Mrs. Lucy	Elementary Teacher
Henley, Mr. Francis Coy	Elementary Teacher
Humphreys, Mrs. Bettie N.	Elementary Teacher
Lovett, Mr. Roy H.	Elementary Principal
Lynn, Miss Vyrene	Elementary Teacher
McCollum, Mr. Melle	Elementary Teacher
Mann, Mrs. Julia E.	Elementary Teacher
Meekins, Mrs. Lois Marie	Elementary Teacher
Muldrew, Mr. Winston J.	High School Principal
Norris, Mrs. Edith T.	Elementary Teacher
Porterfield, Mr. Paul	Elementary Principal
Powell, Mrs. Thelma	Community Leader
Robertson, Mrs. Nellie Joe	Elementary Teacher
Ross, Mrs. Chester	Librarian
Rowland, Miss Mary Emma	Elementary Teacher
Ruffin, Mrs. Jewel	Remedial Reading
Sims, Mrs. Ella	Secondary - Business
Vernon, Mrs. Clara Mae	Elementary Teacher
White, Mr. Gascyl Riley	Elementary Teacher
Yates, Mrs. Henryetta	Secondary - Study Hall
Carter, Mrs. Eddie	Elementary Teacher
Dorsey, Mrs. Laura	Junior High
Taweel, F. H.	Mathematics
Kelly, Mrs. Lenora	Elementary Teacher
Marrable, Jack	Social Studies Teacher
Milner, Mrs. Amanda	Elementary Teacher
Muldrew, Mrs. Senora	Elementary Teacher
Reynolds, Mrs. Jean	Elementary Teacher
Sawyers, Mrs. Kathleen	Elementary Teacher
Tyson, Mrs. Nancy	Elementary Teacher
West, Mr. David	Social Studies Teacher
Wilson, Mrs. Letha	Elementary Teacher

b - Institute Staff

Permanent staff and their general functions:

Dr. A. B. Wetherington, Ouachita Baptist University, Director, has been the general coordinator. Maintained the necessary reports and supervised the over-all plans and operations. Contacted consultants and worked directly with the El Dorado School Group. Highly perceptive of school needs and most informed of the state situation.

Dr. C. M. Strack, Henderson State College, Associate Director, supervised and coordinated daily program activities, managed evaluation procedures and reports to participants, provided seminar leadership and consulted with the Sparkman School Group. Made arrangements with some consultants. Most effective in managing group activities.

Dr. W. A. Dahlstedt, Henderson State College, Staff Consultant, presented lectures on school planning and school community relations. He also provided seminar leadership and consultant aid to the Smackover School Group along with individual consultation for reports being made on teacher plans. Excellent stimulation to group planning.

Mrs. Juanita Sandford, Ouachita Baptist University, Staff Consultant, lectured on three occasions in the area of anthropology and sociology. In addition, she gave seminar leadership, guided the Smackover School Group and consulted with teachers on their individual plans. Well prepared and pertinent lectures.

Mr. Hugh Watson, Principal, El Dorado Schools, Assistant Director (Negro), reported topics on progress of the Institute, made general evaluations and recommendations, lead a seminar group and assisted in the El Dorado School Group. Evidenced a keen concern, good humor, and sharp perception. Had difficulty with individual conferences with local personnel.

Mr. Oscar Davis, Principal, Sparkman Schools, Assistant Director, (Negro), reported on reactions to the Summer Institute program, submitted general evaluations, gave seminar leadership and consulted with developments by the Sparkman School Group. Illness hindered his activity in the last few days. Essentially conservative and a stabilizing influence.

Mr. Joe Garr (Negro) was selected in October to replace Mr. Davis who resigned. Mr. Garr is a young teacher who is interested in and capable of leadership responsibilities concerning problems of school desegregation.

Each member of this staff was active in working with participant problems and requests. On occasion the contacts to assist consultant travel were shared by the staff. Routine staff meetings provided exchanges in understanding and suggestions to modify program. Seminar leaders supervised maintenance of a seminar diary and distributed daily evaluation reports to participants.

The regular staff functioned satisfactorily together. They provided easy access by participants to the staff and the reverse. They were available on all occasions of need and diligently applied themselves to the program.

Dr. Dahlstedt and Mrs. Sandford received most mention by participants in their comments. Both were well received.

c - Consultants

1 - Phase I Consultants and guest lecturers:

(a) Dr. Lawrence Davis, President of A.M. & N. College. His keynote topic, "The Role of School Administration in the Desegregation Process." His address and dialogue with participants evolved the historical base, the current need, the demand for leadership and initiative concerning the current and developing status of desegregation.

(b) Dr. Frank L. Stanley, Jr., Associate Director, National Urban League presented ways and means of enlisting the total potential of all aspects of the community toward achieving quality education through school desegregation programs.

Both Dr. Davis and Dr. Stanley were openly received and invited to local school community meetings by school superintendents. Dr. Stanley was scheduled to speak to civic groups in Camden and El Dorado in October. He had to cancel the engagements in late September. This weakened the impact of the Institute on community power structure.

2 - Phase II Consultants and guest lecturers:

Eleven guest consultants made presentations at one or more of the general sessions of the Institute. Several were both speakers and resource consultants for seminar and school groups.

During each of the three weeks the Institute emphasis was upon a different area of concern. The areas of interest and consultants were as follows:

(a) Background of Segregation and Its Impact on Education and Integration

(1) Dr. Boyce Drummond, Chairman of the Division of Social Science, Henderson State College, made the first presentation to the Institute, speaking on "Segregation: A Historical Perspective". Dr. Drummond's lecture was well prepared and thorough. In it he took the group from 1790, when 19% of the population was Negro, to the present with Negroes comprising 11% of the population. Within this period the speaker revealed many dates and events which are necessary for our understanding of the Negro and his present situation. Dr. Drummond pointed out that there is still a great deal of obscurity about the period of history in which contemporary segregation laws arose.

(2) Dr. Ralph A. Phelps, Jr., President of Ouachita Baptist University has researched rather extensively the "History of Negro Education in America." His presentation on the above subject was very thorough. Because of his intense interest in Negro education and his desire to help solve the problems occasioned by desegregation, he is personally anxious to participate in institutes of this nature and to see that Ouachita Baptist University continues to play a role in helping to solve these problems through in-service education programs.

(3) Dr. Hilquit Lynch, Chairman of the Division of Sociology, Henderson State College, stimulated the participants to make special effort to understand the origins of some of the differences between the value systems of the Negro culture and white culture as he spoke on "Social Value System Contrasts in the South." He made extensive use of the overhead projector to show charts, tables, and graphs which clarified and substantiated the points of his lecture. In conclusion, Dr. Lynch pointed out that desegregation is the area of greatest conflict between Negro and white.

These first three lectures provided a much needed basis of information for both Negro and white participants which will help them understand some of the problems incident to desegregation.

(4) Dr. Gertrude Noar, Educational Consultant, gave two keynote lectures and served extensively as a resource consultant for the seminar groups. Two of Dr. Noar's books, The Teacher and Integration and Teaching the Disadvantaged had been distributed to the participants in the Institute and served as background material for her lectures. Dr. Noar provided valuable information and help for teachers and administrators encountering problems incident to desegregation. She spent considerable time discussing the necessity of understanding the culturally disadvantaged child and presenting methods for reaching and teaching this child. Evaluations by participants revealed Dr. Noar to be one of the two most popular consultants. There is little doubt that the brief time Dr. Noar spent in the Institute will bear fruit far into the future.

(b) Learning and Curriculum Demands in Desegregated Schools

(1) Mr. Edmund Zaslow, Principal of Public School 115, New York City, presented two lectures, "New Directions in Desegregated Schools" and "Learning Needs in Desegregated Schools." In addition to these very thorough presentations, he served as resource consultant in the seminar groups. Mr. Zaslow's participation in the Institute was valuable for several reasons: (1) he spoke of the various methods which have been tried or are being tried; (2) he spoke of the disadvantaged and the problems of desegregation in a large urban, industrialized area of the United States thereby giving the participants the opportunity to see the contrasts and similarities of that area and the one in which they live. The members of the Institute were challenged to experiment with new materials and methods in educating the disadvantaged.

(2) Mrs. Rachel Myers is the Principal of a Negro grade school in the Little Rock System. This school employs one full time white male teacher and one half-time white teacher. Mrs. Myers' function in the Institute was to speak on "Innovation and Desegregation" and to serve for one day as resource consultant in the school groups. She provided information which might serve to alleviate some of the fears and dispel some of the myths in the minds of white teachers going into desegregated school situations.

(3) Mrs. Joyce Springer is a sixth grade teacher in an all white school in the Little Rock System. She was one of the most popular keynote speakers and very effective as a resource consultant in the seminar groups. The subject of her presentation was "The View from the Integrated Classroom." She provided valuable help to Negro teachers concerning problems which a Negro teacher going into a white school may encounter. Two of the school groups have indicated a strong desire to have Mrs. Springer speak to meetings of faculty and interested persons in their communities during Phase III of this Institute.

(4) Mrs. Marguerite Goodloe, Principal of Peake Elementary School, gave a good view of the white principal in a Negro school. Having participated in Ouachita's Title IV Institute in 1965-66, she related to the group her eagerness to go into a desegregated school situation. Mrs. Goodloe was very articulate in stating her professional interest in teaching the slow learner and the disadvantaged child. She presented to the group her plan for a non-graded school for 1967-68.

(5) Mrs. Bettye Jackson, Elementary Teacher for 1966-67, in a desegregated school of the Little Rock System, spoke to the Institute using as a title for her presentation: "A Classroom Teacher's View: Applying New Directions." Mrs. Jackson was very effective and provided valuable help in describing the Negro teacher's role in the desegregated classroom. In her presentation she gave two important observations for all teachers to remember: first, "the family's socio-economic level, not race, is the prime factor in establishing a youngster's goals and value system," and, second, a teacher should "avoid labeling all problems between the races as racial problems."

(c) Community and School Needs and Understandings in Desegregation

(1) Mrs. Conella Brown, Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent of Schools in Cleveland, Ohio, in charge of human relations, proved to be the most popular speaker from outside the state. She was able to establish good rapport almost immediately with all participants and staff as she spoke on "Community Relations in Desegregation." In addition to the

two keynote presentations, Mrs. Brown served extensively in the seminar and school group. She is outstanding in group dynamics and in creating an atmosphere for freedom of inquiry and exchange of ideas. Because of her vibrant personality and her ability to articulate her many and varied experiences in the realm of human relations, she will continue to be in much demand as a consultant in institutes of this nature. Plans are underway to invite her to help in Phase III of this Institute.

(2) Dr. Theodore Elliott, professor of Education at A.M. & N. College at Pine Bluff, was the final keynote speaker. Dr. Elliott spoke on the subject "Seeing the Individual in Desegregation." He emphasized the necessity of viewing people as individuals rather than members of racial or ethnic groups. Dr. Elliott pointed out that dealing with people as members of groups leads to reacting to them with stereotypes while dealing with people as individuals will generate respect and genuine communication. The speaker closed his lecture by stating that "the Negro wants to be a part of the forces that shape his life, an integral part of the American way of life."

(d) Data concerning Phase III consultants are detailed in the section of the report on that phase. The consultants were:

Dr. Lawrence Davis, President
A.M. & N. College
Pine Bluff, Arkansas

Dr. Cecil McDermott
Chairman, Department of Mathematics
Hendrix College
Conway, Arkansas

Dr. Joe Frost
Professor of Education
University of Texas
Austin, Texas

Dr. Paul Root
Associate Professor of History
Ouachita Baptist University
Arkadelphia, Arkansas

Mr. Leroy Miles
Assistant Professor of Sociology
Henderson State College
Arkadelphia, Arkansas

Mrs. Mattie Crossley
Supervisor of Instruction
Memphis Public Schools
Memphis, Tennessee

Mrs. Joyce Springer
Sixth Grade Teacher
Little Rock Public Schools
Little Rock, Arkansas

Mr. Homer Cox
Supervisor of Instruction
Pulaski County Schools
Little Rock, Arkansas

d - Content

Program Content Phase I

The participants are listed above. Permanent staff listing and comments are shown under Phase II.

Program

The Phase I schedule called for meetings at Camden, Arkansas, Whiteside Junior High School. Dates scheduled were April 20, 27, May 4, 11, 1967. Sessions ran from 4 to 10 P.M. with a supper break at 5:30. The general format for each session was the same although the length of lectures and seminars remained flexible. Methods of approach centered on a lecture - discussion - seminar sequence in which open reaction among participants and with consultants was encouraged. A brief evaluative comment is made for each session with added evaluations stated at the conclusion of the Phase I portion.

The program as carried out for Phase I was essentially as scheduled. Variations made were minor and consisted of adjustments in timing in order to make a more effective presentation. For example, the period 4:00 to 4:30 was used for informal discussion. The primary aims and accomplishments for the session are outlined in the following.

Session 1, April 20, 1967. This meeting had and achieved two purposes. One, to orient and introduce the participants from school districts at El Dorado, Smackover, Harmony Grove, Camden, and Sparkman to the total program and to the concept in Phase I. Second, to present a keynote speech by Dr. Lawrence Davis, President, A. M. & N. College, Pine Bluff, Arkansas.

Dr. A. B. Wetherington, Director, and Dr. C. M. Strack, Associate Director, presented the program concepts to the entire participant group. The nature of each phase, the major objectives and chief program plans were outlined.

Dr. Lawrence Davis spoke to the topic of The Role of Administration in the Desegregation Process. This keynote expression evolved the historical base, the current need, the demand for leadership and initiative in relation to the current and developing status of desegregation in each school district. The participants were challenged to take the lead and set the pace toward a quality education for all peoples.

Small group discussions, four in all and moderated by the permanent staff, followed the keynote speech. A summary of major points and questions was made and presented to a final session. In addition, each staff member reported an assessment of the day's session to the director.

Staff assessments judged the initial meeting to have reached its goals. Participants evidenced a willingness to explore the issues raised, to exchange views and to suggest paths for development. There was some uncertainty of expectancy among participants, largely because of the newness of the situation. Little hostility was evidenced although some sensitivity to Negro related terms was noted. A larger role for the assistant directors, already planned, was confirmed as desirable.

Session 2, April 27, 1967. The essential goal at this session was to allow the Washington office under Title IV and Title VI to present aspects of the Federal program. Mr. Darl Hulit and Mr. Waite Madison were present. At the request of Mr. Hulit, the program was modified to allow Mr. Madison to function primarily in response to the questions and concerns brought out by the participants. Both Hulit and Madison visited among the small group discussions. At a final session for the day, the participants submitted a variety of points to which Mr. Madison or Mr. Hulit responded.

The staff assessments indicate mixed judgments concerning session two. It was clearly a reaction provoking meeting and each discussion group brought several points for comment. Mr. Hulit's emphasis became confused by the participant response so that the main thrust toward locally generated programs and responsibility was by-passed while individuals reacted to minor illustrative comments raised. The general format continued to be appropriate. Hindsight suggests that a formal comment by Mr. Madison on the means employed to operate the Title VI program would have been helpful to understanding the task.

Session 3, May 4, 1967. The objective set out was to open the door to local cooperation among Negro and white organizations. Dr. Frank L. Stanley, Jr., Associate Director, National Urban League, made the main presentation. The thrust of Dr. Stanley's comments proposed enlisting the total potential of all aspects of the community toward achieving quality education for all. He offered the services of the National Urban League as a professional aid and pointed to the importance of the school as the avenue through which change may be achieved without destruction and serious disruption of the community. At the concluding period participants filled out a team rating sheet. Responses were to be reported later.

The session was openly and constructively received. Group discussions identified several organized avenues for cooperative local program involvement. The atmosphere of the entire meeting was endowed with a spirit of "getting at" the job. This was especially true in a special session where the superintendents met with Dr. Stanley and Dr. Wetherington.

Session 4, May 11, 1967. A meeting aimed toward bringing out the issues thus far identified and assessing areas of need seen by the participants. Activity was kept in the discussion groups for the bulk of the time. A short general session in the beginning was used to summarize the responses made by participants on a "Team Rating" instrument. The ratings had been in terms of intra-faculty status and for faculty-community status. The instrument used is shown in the appendix. Each school district represented among the participants was shown to have a wide variation among the faculty as they look at themselves and at their community. Furthermore, each school evidences a marked loss of rating when assessing their community as compared to the faculty relationships.

Small group sessions met for three hours following the first period and reported back to the entire Institute in the final hour. The reports identified three areas of emphasis and concern to be in need of attention. (A) Expanded contact and interaction between school and community; (B) Classroom teacher needs in skills and sensitivity to deal with a "new mix" of students; (C) Faculty desegregation policy and practice to produce a single faculty without social catagories.

The fourth session was judged to be successful. Certainly, Phase I of the Institute could have gained from added time and the participants could have thus formulated a clearer statement of future program. It is believed, however, that the meeting demonstrated sharp progress when set against the hesitancy and uncertainty of the first session. The chief weakness noted was a continuing reluctance on the part of persons present to focus upon their specific school situation and to generate plans to meet whatever needs are evident. It is also true, however, that it was not expected to go very far in this direction in Phase I. Even so, the administrators from both Camden and Harmony Grove, who will not be present in Phase II, evidenced an initial formulation of programs to meet conditions of increased desegregation.

Program Content Phase II

The general schedule and program content are combined in the following so that sequence and content emphasis reflect participant experience during the three weeks.

Theme: June 12-16: Background of Segregation and its Impact on Education and Integration

June 12, Monday a.m.: The final registration of the students from the three participating school districts was completed. Students were oriented to the specific objectives, format of the Institute and were given specific assignments to be completed by those wishing college credit either at Henderson or Ouachita.

June 12, Monday p.m.: Dr. Boyce Drummond, Chairman of the Division of Social Science at Henderson, presented a lecture on "Historical Perspective on Desegregation." In his lecture, Dr. Drummond oriented the group on the development of segregation practices as they grew in the United States. Historical development included the growth of the so-called "Jim Crow" laws and social perspectives based upon political, economic and social forces existing or growing in the United States over its course of history. The general conclusion reached helped the group achieve important understandings of how segregation grew in the United States, how it very definitely separated the races in practices of living, and how such practices actually built a pluralistic culture in this country. Specific phases indicated how, through such practices, the Negro race has been relegated to the place of second rate citizenship with all its limitations such as poor educational programs, work opportunities and obstacles to their rights such as voting.

The information presented by Dr. Drummond was discussed during the rest of the day by dividing the groups into seminars. Here, under the direction of a staff member, the participants had opportunity to discuss the information presented and gain further insight into the topic.

June 13, Tuesday a.m.: Dr. Ralph Phelps, President of Ouachita Baptist University, addressed the group on the "History of Negro Education." His excellent discussion reviewed early interest in Negro education and its erratic, spotty nature. The contrast in private vs. government efforts was examined. The slow growth of acceptance and the resistances experienced were outlined. The impact of the changing legal status in recent years completed the lecture. In the seminar group which followed, students had opportunity to deepen their insight and see more exactly the limitations of segregated education.

During the morning the staff administered the "Inventory of Beliefs" to the entire student group. The purpose of this administration was to help the students learn something about his or her flexibility or rigidity in thinking. An interpretation was later given to the students (see section on evaluation).

June 13, Tuesday p.m.: Dr. Hilquit Lynch, Chairman of the Division of Sociology, Henderson, lectured on the "Social Value System Contrast in the South." Herein, Dr. Lynch discussed the values of living attached to the two major races living in this country and paralleled it with the practices of segregation. Interpretations were given in terms of the social and economic developments including the labor and industrial movements. Conclusions reached indicated that segregated systems of living have become deeply intrenched in our society and that this intrenchment built a contrasting system of values between the Negro and white races which have now come to light in open clashes concerning labor, housing, movements of people, civil rights, and public school desegregation legislation.

Discussion was continued in the seminar which followed to extend insights into the understandings of the clash in value systems which were presented and interpreted.

June 14, Wednesday a.m.: Mrs. Juanita Sandford, Instructor in Sociology, Ouachita Baptist University, lectured to the group on "The Racial Problems in Educational Perspective." Mrs. Sandford pointed out to the class how the educator has been called upon to enhance racial understanding, how the government has attempted to regulate and also the fact that the church has taken practically no forward step to ease and improve racial understanding.

The main portion of Mrs. Sandford's presentation centered around what the educator should know about the races and also what he should know about race prejudice. Topics emphasized in the lecture included the following: (a) roles taken by government, church and school in solving racial problems; (b) factors leading to human types, races; (c) race indices; (d) racial misconceptions, blood type commonality; (e) advantageous variations present; (f) knowledge needed by teachers. A list of special references was included with the detailed outline issued to each participant.

June 14, Wednesday p.m.: Dr. Waldo A. Dahlstedt, Professor of Education, Henderson, addressed the group on "The Concept of School Group Planning." The nature of Dr. Dahlstedt's presentation was to help the group recognize a solution of four public school administrative topics common with the desegregation of the public schools. There are (1) desegregation of the faculty, (2) desegregation of school functions and extra-curricular activities, (3) the school desegregation plan under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and (4) the school and partial community desegregation. A procedure was presented outlining a way to approach each of the topics. This procedure included ways of recognizing the problem, the stating of objectives, and ways of influencing policy for action. It was asserted that each faculty concerned must recognize its own problems, determine objectives to be achieved, and find ways to achieve action after the facts and forces bearing upon the issue had been uncovered and interpreted.

The content of the presentation was further developed by the seminars following the lecture and by meetings of the three separate public school faculties comprising the Institute. The three faculties worked together and separately during the second and third weeks of the Institute to determine their respective problems concerning desegregation, the stating of their objectives and determining ways for the school faculty and community to work together in solving specific desegregation problems concerning each school district.

June 15, Thursday and June 16, Friday: Dr. Gertrude Noar, Educational Consultant, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, addressed the group several times on the "Challenges in Teaching the Disadvantaged in Integrated Schools."

The total group, under Dr. Noar's leadership, explored the characteristics and symptoms associated with the disadvantaged chil. A list of suggestions were then interassociated to probable basic causal conditions and possible approaches for dealing with the child's need were pointed out.

Seminar groups further dealt with the above topic with the assistance of Dr. Noar. Dr. Noar was very stimulating in her presentation and brought a number of useful innovations in instruction for the participants to consider for use in their respective classes in their schools.

The final contribution by Dr. Noar was a candid review and commentary of her observations of Institute activities and participation. The willingness of participation, sincerity, concern were complimented. Some reluctance, hostility and rigidity was noted. The use of democratic processes was urged and participants were encouraged to share leadership roles and develop discussion skills.

Theme: June 19-23: Learning and Curriculum Demands in Desegregated Schools

June 19, Monday a.m. and June 20, Tuesday a.m.: Mr. Edmund Zaslow, a principal of Public School 115, New York City Public School System, addressed the group on "New Directions and Learning Needs in Desegregated Schools."

Major emphasis was placed upon utilizing the experience of children and providing experience for children wherein they could better learn how to communicate and how to appreciate each other. Emphasis was given to the contrasts of language habits common with lower class disadvantaged and middle class children. Within this pattern of understanding, Mr. Zaslow discussed the kinds of method and concepts of understanding necessary for the teacher to develop and utilize in teaching children at an early age for modifying the speech habits common with disadvantaged children.

Mr. Zaslow's concepts were further developed in the seminar groups conducted by the Institute staff members. The discussion of methods and techniques for teaching language experience to the disadvantaged when contrasted with middle class pupils appeared to be a controversial issue for the group and was not settled in a substantial manner.

These topics formed the core around which the discussion developed: how children learn best, the nature of the child's world, involving the child in the classroom, linguistic insights, the pluralistic U. S. society, individualizing instruction, hopeful new approaches.

June 19, Monday p.m.: Dr. Waldo A. Dahlstedt, Professor of Education at Henderson State College, addressed the group on the "Faculty Adaptation to Innovation." Dr. Dahlstedt presented ways in which the administration could assist the community and faculty in facing and improving the educational enterprise. The content of the presentation included the responsibilities of the administration for the improvement of instruction, what teachers need from the administration in order to function as teachers, and items building professional identification. The goal of the presentation was to show that when every student is afforded the best that a school system has to offer, then and only then will we be able to say that we have achieved true equality of educational opportunity. In order to achieve educational opportunity, the faculty must adapt to the innovations required for meeting the needs of both the student and society. Seminars and school groups enlarged upon and explored local application.

June 20, Tuesday p.m.: Mrs. Rachel Myers, Principal of Ish Elementary School, Little Rock Public Schools, presented an address on "Desegregation, Innovation and Curriculum Implications" resulting from her experience as a principal of an integrated school in the Little Rock school system.

The following extracts from Mrs. Myers comments illustrate their emphasis: desegregation . . . challenges curriculum change . . . and brings together the rejected and accepted . . . those taught to "stay in their place" and those whose place was wherever they chose to make it; building a curriculum for this multi-level cultural situation will not be a simple task . . . the needs of the child must be the determining factors . . .; recognizing the certainty of change, educators must be constantly willing . . . to upgrade . . . and prepare for tomorrow's community; the success of all newly initiated programs is dependent upon the . . . teacher to implement . . . in light of the needs of the children she teaches.

June 21, Wednesday: The entire morning was employed by the school group sessions. Mrs. Myers consulted with each faculty as they explored possible ways to extend the effectiveness of integration and education within their respective communities.

In the afternoon, Mrs. Juanita Sandford lectured on "The Culture Concept and the Teaching-Learning Process." This presentation gave a broad as well as a specific understanding of the place of culture in the teaching-learning situation. It was pointed to the contrasts evident between Negro and white cultures. Major aspects of the lecture were: the role of anthropology, meaning and nature of culture, functions and conditions for culture, universal patterns, personality relationships, ethnocentrism.

Seminar groups discussed the information presented by Mrs. Sandford. Emphasis was placed on recognizing the cultural contrasts evident in their respective communities in terms of developing greater understanding in providing educational opportunity to pluralistic cultures within the same community.

June 22, Thursday a.m.: Mrs. Joyce Springer, an elementary teacher, Little Rock Public Schools, addressed the group on "The View from the Integrated Classroom." Her rendition of experiences in teaching in an integrated faculty and of the personal reactions occurring made the conditions real and meaningful. The following will illustrate topics presented: two student records which show nearly equal achievement but reflect one family at $672 annual income, another with $16,000, suggest the importance of occupational equality of opportunity; I found no communications problem that was racially associated; Negro students are more likely to respond to authoritarian discipline in the classroom whereas white students are more often excitable, verbal and need more frequent regulation for classroom conditions; it is necessary to adjust the instructional process for an integrated class but no more than that demanded by the annual change of students; my reception by the faculty was professional and by parents cooperative.

The afternoon sessions were devoted to school group discussions. Mrs. Springer served as consultant to each faculty and assisted in the development of their School Status Analyses.

June 23, Friday a.m.: Mrs. Bettye Jackson, an elementary teacher, Little Rock Public Schools, addressed the group on "A Classroom Teacher's View Applying New Directions."

She pointed out these features: both Negro and white teachers may dislike being newly assigned to classes chiefly of the other race; the family socio-economic level is the prime basis for the child's goals and value system; both inferior and superior feelings have the potential of restricting personal growth; a segregated society has biased the outlook of both groups; the kind of adults who grow up through desegregated schools will provide the ultimate base of evaluation of desegregation.

Mrs. Myers, Mrs. Springer, and Mrs. Jackson each presented views based upon actual experience in working in a desegregated school program. The participants were given information concerning the preparation teachers should make concerning future teaching in integrated school systems; in addition these speakers presented ways teachers can broaden and modify their attitudes in order for them to more successfully teach disadvantaged children and teach successfully in desegregated schools.

The faculty groups from the three participating school districts further discussed the information presented and questioned the three speakers on problems of teaching relative to the Little Rock system when compared with the problems existing with the faculty in the participating school systems.

June 23, Friday p.m.: Dr. C. M. Strack, Associate Director, interpreted the Inventory of Beliefs and Attitude Survey administered to the student group early in the Institute program, (see evaluation section).

Dr. Dahlstedt conducted a review of the accomplishments and progress of the Institute to date. The entire permanent staff participated.

Theme: June 26-30: Community and School Needs and Understandings in Desegregation

June 26, Monday a.m.: Mrs. Juanita Sandford, Instructor in Sociology, Ouachita Baptist University, addressed the group on "Cultural Relativity as if Related to Problems of Desegregation." Mrs. Sandford defined cultural relativity and gave its implications for understanding the disadvantaged child. Emphasis was placed on understanding the culture of the disadvantaged and how the culture of the disadvantaged effects classroom performance. Particular stress was given to teaching so that the teacher relates what is taught to the reality of the student's life. The speaker asserted that all aspects of the teaching process, including teaching material, must be related to the realities of the life of the disadvantaged child if he is to learn effectively. Other aspects of the lecture included: comments on the importance of assessing culture variations in terms of their purpose rather than their method; a listing of disadvantaged Negro culture handicaps and contrasts; difficulties of truly evaluating students are more numerous with greater culture variety in a classroom.

Group seminars wherein the discussion of cultural relativity was conducted by staff members completed the work of the morning period.

June 26, Monday p.m. and June 27, Tuesday a.m.: Mrs. Conella Brown, Administrative Assistant in Human Relations to the Superintendent of Schools, Cleveland, Ohio, spoke to the group on "Community Relations in Desegregation."

Mrs. Brown presented the nature of prejudice, how it is formed, how it can be changed or altered, its permanency and how prejudice controls teaching with certain individual students. Particular force was placed on the need for teachers to re-evaluate their attitudes, and how to re-evaluate their prejudices by attempting to re-examine themselves. The major question proposed was how do we help students to "unlearn" their prejudices and how do we minimize the learning of hard core biases? The subject of how to re-evaluate one's prejudices and how to re-examine oneself was continued in the seminar groups conducted by the staff.

Mrs. Brown completed her formal remarks under the topic "Relating School and Community in Desegregation." Methods were presented by Mrs. Brown on how local faculties could help themselves in relating the school and community through desegregation and at the same time improve community-school relations which would enhance human relations. An exploration of the following was incorporated among the considerations stated: the federal impact has accelerated educational assessment in many new ways with which a community needs to become involved; it is all too likely that a school program will kill student enthusiasm to learn; parents need to know and be told the school potential, continuing dialogue is imperative; the student can establish good effective codes of school participation when given a chance; many more women are capable of moving into administrative areas.

The seminar groups further discussed the methods prescribed by Mrs. Brown and attempted to find ways of utilizing them in their local communities.

June 27, Tuesday p.m.: Mrs. Margarite Goodloe, Principal, Peake Elementary School, Arkadelphia, Arkansas, described her experiences as a new principal of a Negro elementary school with both white and Negro teachers. She stressed the efforts made to meet the challenges of a new situation and adjust the school plans and program to a re-assessment made by the faculty of students' needs for effective learning. An ungraded primary program was one of the outcomes described.

The presentation was followed with seminar discussions including special attention to the potentials of service in adult education and adult involvement.

June 28, Wednesday a.m.: Dr. Dahlstedt again addressed the group on "Administration and Community School Groups." Emphasis was placed on potentials among the three faculties to further their plans for greater and more purposeful desegregation of their respective school systems.

School groups were again formed and the three faculties under staff leadership continued to develop their respective school desegregation plans. Emphasis was placed upon the policies and practices needing adjustment.

The last visiting consultant to appear before the Institute was Dr. Theodore Elliott, Professor of Education, Arkansas A.M. & N. College, Pine Bluff, Arkansas. Dr. Elliott spoke to the group on "Seeing the Individual in Desegregation."

Dr. Elliott's presentation centered around several important questions, namely:

1) Looking at a person through a culture screen, how do you perceive your friends? Do we accept those which make us feel comfortable?
2) Do you see integration as something making you feel comfortable or uncomfortable?
3) Do you have to look at minorities as below you or less than you in order to feel comfortable?
4) How do we accept each other? by fear, timidity, by insincerity, by respect?

Dr. Elliott gave the members of the Institute a number of psychological reasons and supports as well as explanations to the foregoing questions.

Seminar groups continued through discussion to learn more about how one could expect to act with and toward minority group individuals and to see areas wherein each participant must try to modify his own behavior. Dr. Elliott consulted with each seminar during the discussions.

June 29, Thursday a.m.: During the first period, Dr. Elliott again spoke to the group on "Retaining a Relation to the Person." His presentation was a continuation and expansion of the subject presented the preceding day.

The remainder of the morning and afternoon was spent with the school group faculty meetings. Dr. Elliott consulted with the groups. The plans for further desegregation of the schools in the three participating districts were finalized for presentation to all the members of the Institute. School groups were asked to list special needs they envisioned for Phase III.

At the request of several participants, a committee was formed to arrange an informal evening get-together. About 38 of the Institute personnel attended and enjoyed a variety of games and activities during the evening.

June 30, Friday a.m. and p.m.: The last day of the Desegregation Institute instructional program was divided into three sections as follows:

Section 1. Each member of the Institute staff reviewed steps taken and noted developing outcomes of the Institute. The essence of two of the staff comments illustrates the reviews made.

a) During the three weeks of this Institute we have been provided with a wealth of information and inspiration. I tried to select from several of our visiting consultants' keynote presentations, statements which I could keep and make part of myself.

Dr. Noar said, "Intelligence can be created." I aspire to create in my own children and in my students.

Mr. Zaslow gave us the words of another who said, "The bravest people in the world today are the ones who are trying to change institutions." I aspire to be brave.

Mrs. Brown said, "The War on Poverty and the Civil Rights Movement have done more to upgrade education than anything since Sputnik." I hope we can fully appreciate and feel the impact of this statement. I have heard educators "damn" the Civil Rights Movement and the War on Poverty. We should be grateful that this was an indirect result and also ashamed that our upgrading of education was a by-product of a people's demand for human rights.

One of our speakers said, "Where you stand as a person is the moral issue which is at stake. The most important test is the test of involvement."

Isn't it too bad that we had to wait until money was involved to do something about desegregation?

My involvement as a teacher and a speaker in these Institutes is my way of challenging my white colleagues to accept their moral responsibility and to say with me to the Negro, "I am ashamed to be a part of the social order which has perpetuated a system of injustice and second-class citizenship, and this is my way of trying to correct a problem which I did not help to create."

I hope we can teach our children that they too have a moral obligation to all people of all races in all the world.

b) "Based on my talks with participants and observed work and reports, you have made pronounced gains in general knowledge racially related, in local conditions and understanding, in your job as related to desegregation. You have read in areas and on topics previously untouched and perhaps unknown.

Discussion and exchange have enabled you to grow in ability to associate with each other, to work as a group, to search out the varied aspects of a situation and to analyze their relationship. There has been an observable increase in ability to apply courses of action and to choose among several potential courses.

It seems to me that there has been a new understanding evolving of the balance of pressures for change and a recognition of the essential need for change in order that there be real life. Without the processes of change we are likely to require a mortician more than an M.D.

There continues, however, to be a residue of somewhat over-emotional, sometimes unprofessional, often negative reaction to occurances related to integration. It behooves all of us to be alert to these tendencies and to guard ourselves and others as we seek to continue the dialogue and actions necessary. We can not ask for acceptance without granting it to others."

Section 2. The School Status Analyses for the respective participating school districts were presented to all participants by chosen members of the three school groups (see appendix).

Section 3. The Director of the Desegregation Institute, Dr. A. B. Wetherington, made a summary of the Institute's outcomes as he saw them. Dr. Wetherington gave the participants a general statement on the nature of the Phase III portion of the Title IV Institute to be conducted in the three participating school districts during the coming school year.

During the morning the last of the reading reports and the assigned Institute papers were collected. Evaluation was made of these materials in order to determine a grade for college credit.

The essential focus of program and objectives has been to provide conditions under which a particular public school faculty may, with consultive help, isolate its special needs in desegregation and formulate a plan to alleviate these needs.

The Institute aimed to enhance the capabilities of public school faculties in the following:

1. Increasing insight and understanding of the impact of multicultural contrasts on teaching and learning in the desegregated classroom.
2. Exploring ways to extend desegregation throughout the public schools including an increased involvement and understanding of the community.
3. Providing ways to establish team approaches made up of the administration and faculty to more fully identify educational problems incident to desegregation and to determine ways for solving or reducing them.
4. Providing opportunity for faculty and administration to grow together professionally toward carrying out the purposes of the public school in American society.

The presence of teachers and administrators from among both Negro and white faculty while engaged in the activities described has achieved significant growth toward all purposes. The length of time involved has been near optimism in view of a program of follow-up to come.

Methods

Instructional and participation methods include large and small groups and individual conferences. Lectures, personal evaluative instruments, group discussions, readings, reports were involved. As anticipated, participants stated that seminars were instrumental in getting more persons to openly engage in the processes occurring. It is presently believed, however, that the school group in its mission of looking at a specific system and its potentials was the most effective method of attack. Here the consultant, reading and exchange of ideas came to focus upon current mutually important areas.

Teaching Aids

Materials and aids included library references, individual references distributed to the participants, the over-head projector, sound amplifier, and mimeographed outlines of presentations. The use of outlines was most effective. Distributed materials provided a common base for discussions and included the following:

SEGREGATION: A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE - Keynote lecture by Dr. Boyce Drummond
CULTURAL RELATIVITY AND THE CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED CHILD - Address by Mrs. Juanita Sandford
Participant responses to statements in report, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools
NEW DIRECTIONS AND LEARNING NEEDS IN DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS - Keynote lecture by Edmund Zaslow
Quotations used by Mrs. Edmund Zaslow
The Lazy Teacher - The Colorless Teacher
UNDERSTANDING - Poem by Elouise B. Rivinus
THE FIVE RIGHTS OF EVERY MAN - Ordway Tead
Discussion topics for Institute groups - Ideas concerning the instructional-learning process
A GENERAL OVERVIEW OF EDUCATIONAL IDEAS - Comments by Hugh P. Watson
COMMUNITY RELATIONS IN DESEGREGATION - Address by Mrs. Conella Brown
A CLASSROOM TEACHER'S VIEW APPLYING NEW DIRECTIONS - Address by Mrs. Bettye Jackson
THE VIEW FROM THE INTEGRATED CLASSROOM - Address by Mrs. Joyce Springer
Reaction - Attitude Survey
DESEGREGATION, INNOVATIONS AND CURRICULUM IMPLICATIONS - Address by Mrs. R. A. Myers
Human Relations Inventory

The bibliography of library readings, 158 sources, was given each participant.

Although other items may well have been substituted, it is believed that there was no significant shortage which by absence detracted from the impact of the sessions.

Consultation and Guidance

An examination of staff feed-back shows that nearly all of the participants engaged in individual consultation with one or more staff members. The subjects of these guidance actions included reading reports, Institute papers, school status analyses, individual plans and concerns about specific teaching assignments. In three known instances, the teachers concerned stated that the conferences arranged enabled them to continue working in their situations. Two school groups evidenced special need for individual counseling which, when provided, enabled the group to overcome internal confusion and proceed on their study of the local situation.

Informal Program

Aspects of the informal program included association among participants in car-pools, at meals, during coffee breaks, in dormitories, and an evening social. The Institute encouraged interchange among participants on all these occasions and urged members to take advantage of the opportunities.

The social on the last evening of the session grew out of an interest among the participants. Both Negro and white members attended. The occasion provided tangible evidence that at least one-half of the Institute personnel could enjoy a non-required "fun and games" kind of get-together. There is some hope that similar activity may develop in the communities involved.

There were three informal evenings and dinners in which the visiting consultants and staff discussed a variety of personal and professional interests. Participant-staff discussions, as well, occurred informally. Both of these kinds of association came about in the houses of resident staff members.

Facilities

The library and dormitory facilities of both colleges were open to and used by the participants. Classrooms were used on the Henderson campus. Lectures were given in a small auditorium seating 150.

Seminars and school groups used classrooms near-by. It would have been better had all the rooms used been in the same building. The distance between buildings, however, was small. For coffee breaks, participants had easy access to the student union.

The informal social, developed by a participant committee, used the lounge of one of the dormitories successfully. Considering the commuting proportion among the participants, the social was very well attended, 52% of total.

In each library, materials were set aside for easy access and placed on a reserve status. Total materials available for reference are shown on the bibliography appended. There were 142 references placed on reserve for readings. These were used most by persons taking work for credit.

Participation of Local School System

Prior to the initial proposal, the school administrators involved were contacted as to their interest and need. Several conferences took place with each and as a result the school districts of El Dorado, Smackover, Sparkman and Gurdon assisted in the initial concept. Later, Gurdon felt it necessary to place its efforts elsewhere. Camden and Harmony Grove, however, expressed interest in being included and did participate in Phase I.

In essence the program thus far completed (Phases I and II) was formulated through cooperative consultation with the local school leaders later included.

The follow-up plans thus far formed and those evolved in the next months will all be completed by consultation with local school administrators.

Evaluation and Evaluation Procedures Phase II

The following evaluative steps were incorporated in the Phase II operations of the Institute:

a) A daily evaluation report was completed by each staff member.
b) A daily participant evaluation report was completed by at least five different participants each day.
c) Staff members made individual assessments of the over-all operations of the three week session.
d) All participants completed a Phase II evaluation form.
e) All participants completed three personal evaluations.
    1) The Inventory of Beliefs
    2) Form A or B Attitude Reaction Survey
    3) Human Relations Inventory
f) Each school faculty group prepared a Status Analysis of their system.

The staff and participant reports on daily evaluations were used as a means of noting needed changes in program and to record reactions. They resulted also in keeping all persons alert to an awareness of assessing the situation. Because of these reactions, program adjustment was readily possible and occurred in the form of shifting seminar meetings, increasing some school group sessions, and adding a consultant who could provide comments on experience as a white teacher in a Negro school. The accumulated evaluations made by participants and staff enabled the Institute to modify emphasis as necessary in maintaining a viable program.

Staff assessments of the Phase II program were largely focused upon observed changes taking place during the session. Although these comments were independently formed, a core of agreement was clearly present. The following gains were recognized: (a) increased willingness to work together on a program for effective education and desegregation; (b) growth in ability to see and accept the individual as such rather than as a "sample" of a group; (c) expanded effectiveness in group planning and in the organization of a faculty for planning; (d) marked gains in the factual background, history, biology, sociology of race concepts and attitudes; (e) increased understanding of the leadership potential and need in desegregation. In each case, however, the staff felt that the gains made were clearly good beginnings and continued effort and experience during Phase III is needed.

One staff summary concluded thus: "With the undoubted progress there continues to be a residual of somewhat over-emotional, sometimes unprofessional, often negative reaction to occurrences related to integration. It behooves all concerned to be alert to these tendencies and to guard ourselves, and others as we seek to continue the dialogue and the actions necessary. We can not ask for acceptance without granting it to others."

In rating and evaluating the Phase II session, the participants responded to prepared statements reported in the following.

INSTITUTE EVALUATION AND RATING

1. How helpful has the Institute been toward increasing your ability to work effectively in an integrated school?

Excellent Good Fair Weak

8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

AVERAGE RATING WAS 6.5 WITH A RANGE FROM 4 TO 8.

2. Have you become more willing to encourage increased levels of integration?

No Somewhat Considerable Very Much

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

AVERAGE RATING WAS 6.0 WITH A RANGE FROM ZERO TO 8.

3. Indicate some activities that you could engage in that will illustrate your self-evaluation above.

I can now work effectively with mixed racial groups or on team teaching with a Negro.
I can now encourage my assignment to an integrated classroom and urge my acquaintances to expand their understanding.
Take advantage of chances to promote acceptance, offer my friendship and urge others.
I can give good reason for integration beyond the level of reducing injustice.
Help others to remove their resentments to integration.
Can listen when talking with laymen but also can express how I feel.
I can invite Negroes to my home when the occasion arises.
Serve on committees that will promote integration.
Instigate bi-racial meetings for discussion.
Encourage "teacher-exchanges" between schools.
I know I can do whatever is necessary.
Can co-sponsor integrated school and community activities.
Could share public accommodations.
Can engage in social activities without apprehension.

4. Indicate by check (✓) the consultant in each group who was most helpful to you and by (x) the consultant in each group who was next most helpful to you.

Group I		Group 2	
Noar	(2nd)	Myers	(2nd)
Zaslow		Springer	(1st)
Brown	(1st)	Jackson	
Elliott		Goodloe	

(Also see consultant evaluation)

5. List several new potentials for which you now feel capable and/or willing as a result of the Institute.

(see #3, comments here generally paralleled that item). The main idea added was a consistent expression of being better able to aid the educational growth of the disadvantaged chil

6. What kind of educational activities would you suggest for the follow-up phase next fall? (Phase III)

Proposals are being incorporated into planning for Phase III.

The responses made by participants to the Inventory of Beliefs were scored, analyzed and fed back. The chief aim, in this case, was to demonstrate the strong similarity between the Negro and white participants. The data, fortunately, supported the looked for results (see appendix). Of the 120 items on the Inventory but 20 showed responses contrasting as much as 18-20% and seven evidenced strongly slanted and similar reactions. The range of scores was essentially the same with the high and low score proportions being very close among both Negro and white participants. In attitudes toward a wide variety of beliefs common to the American culture there was an insignificant difference among the two groups of respondents.

An attitude reaction instrument which was oriented to racial situations resulted in greater contrast. The participants were asked to assess their own and then their communities' attitudes. A Form (A) for white participants and a Form (B) for Negro members were used. The two formats were basically parallel in items and emphasis. The responses on both forms evidenced marked contrast between personal reactions and community assessments.

Both forms and responses made are shown on the following pages. The choices are recorded as a percentage of responses made following each item. The first figure is the personal response percent and the second is the community assessment.

Responses to Reaction--Attitude Survey - Form A

First: Place a checkmark in the space best fitting your attitude. Use the response sheet.
Second: Place a small circle in the space you think best fits attitudes of your associates in school and community. Use the response sheet.

(1st parentheses data, July 1967; 2nd April 1968)

1. Do you find it distasteful, or think it would be to: (% NO)
   a. Join a Negro family for a meal? (70/20) (65/35)
   b. Engage in recreational activity with Negroes? 1) Play cards (55/20) (57/34); 2) Dance (20/20) (32/28); 3) Fish or hunt (70/50) (78/54)
   c. Work on a committee that is mostly Negro? (85/45) (78/54)
   d. Teach in a school where most of the faculty and students are Negro? (55/20) (61/24)
   e. Share an evening in your home with a Negro (or Negro couple)? (55/20) (46/30)
2. Which of these statements express an approximation of your attitude and viewpoint?
   a. Negroes are demanding more than they have a right to. (30/70) (14/27)
   b. Demands by Negroes are in essence a request for special attention beyond equality of opportunity. (10/60) (17/38)
   c. Negroes are trying to push in where they are not wanted. (10/60) (10/34)
   d. Frequently Negro demands are for things or rights that they do not really need or want. (5/45) (14/34)
   e. I usually like people known to me, whether Negro or white, but dislike being told to accept a group. (75/35) (65/48)
   f. Negroes should have been able to achieve nearly all they now seem to demand without any particular campaign or special legislation. (25/10) (27/20)
3. Suppose a Negro has been refused service in an establishment open to the public; which of these possible courses of action would you think acceptible?
   a. The Negro should protest to the manager. (55/10) (51/24)
   b. The Negro should bring suit against the store using such aid as NAACP if needed. (10/5) (3/3)
   c. The Negro should quietly leave the premises (55/90) (48/58)
   d. If a white person of the community has observed the occurrence, which of these actions would you think he should take?
      1) Urge that the Negro be served. (20/0) (13/0)
      2) Let the manager know that he disapproved but take no other action. (55/5) (41/14)
      3) Ignore the incident. (20/90) (17/58)
      4) Take no action but approve the Negro's decision to sue the manager should he do so. (5/0) (10/3)
4. Would you approve or disapprove of the following in your home town? (% APPROVE)
   a. Negroes being served in all restaurants. (95/5) (92/23)
   b. Negroes employed as clerks in any store. (95/35) (95/58)
   c. Negroes being served in barber shops and beauty parlors. (50/5) (52/4)

d. Negroes being invited to join and joining your church. (80/10) (66/8)
e. Negroes as active members of local professional organizations. (100/25) (100/60)
f. A Negro as superintendent of schools. (50/10) (56/0)
g. Employment of Negro teachers for any faculty position. (85/15) (89/32)

5. On the whole, would you say that you like or dislike Negroes? (100/55) (95/75)
6. Would you say that you are more or less prejudiced than your friends? (less - 85/30) (less - 95/24)
7. Do you think Negroes in your area are receiving their appropriate opportunities? (No - 55/25) (No - 63-32)

Responses to Reaction--Attitude Survey - Form B

First: Place a check mark in the space best fitting your attitude. Use the response sheet.

Second: Place a small circle in the space you think best fits attitudes of your associates in school and community. Use the response sheet.

(1st parentheses data, July 1967; 2nd, April 1968)

1. Do you find it distasteful, or think it would be to: (% NO)
   a. Join a white family for a meal? (75/25) (50/36)
   b. Engage in recreational activity with whites? 1) Play cards (58/67) (62/25); 2) Dance (67/50) (75/28); 3) Fish or hunt (58/33) (85/57)
   c. Work on a committee that is mostly white? (75/58) (60/40)
   d. Teach in a school where most of the faculty and students are white? (75/33) (69/37)
   e. Share an evening in your home with a white person (or couple). (67/42) (54/37)
2. Which of these statements express an approximation of your attitude and viewpoint?
   a. Most Caucasians feel that Negroes are demanding more than they have a right to. (42/58) (35/52)
   b. I like most people known to me whether Negro or white but dislike being pushed into association with any group. (25/58) (47/35)
   c. Most Caucasians who work in Civil Rights activities are not really concerned about Negroes. (25/25) (30/35)
   d. Most whites think Negroes are trying to push in where they are not wanted. (42/50) (65/52)
   e. Whites who resist Negro demands frequently do so because they don't know how to do otherwise. (33/25) (30/35)
   f. Negroes should have been able to achieve nearly all they now seem to demand without any particular campaign or special legislation. (58/8) (41/24)
3. Imagine you are one of a newly desegregated faculty. During lunch in the cafeteria three white teachers chose to sit elsewhere than at the faculty table where a Negro teacher is eating. Which of these possible actions would you find appropriate?
   a. Sit with the Negro teacher. (50/42) (52/11)
   b. Sit alone at another table. (8/33) (0/5)

   c. Join the other teachers. (33/42) (41/41)
   d. What would you suggest the Negro teacher should do?
      1) Avoid these white teachers. (0/17) (0/11)
      2) Report the incident to the principal. (8/8) (5/5)
      3) Ask for a change of assignment. (8/33) (5/17)
      4) Ignore the situation. (83/58) (82/30)
4. Would you approve or disapprove of the following in your hometown? (% APPROVE)
   a. Whites freely using all restaurants. (75/25) (80/37)
   b. Open competition for all store clerk jobs. (75/33) (72/33)
   c. Sharing barber and beauty shops with whites. (67/8) (75/25)
   d. Negroes being invited and joining white churches. (83/25) (85/33)
   e. Negroes joining and being active in local (previously white) professional organizations. (88/33) (87/61)
   f. A white principal for the Negro school. (50/17) (64/41)
   g. Employment of white teachers in any faculty position. (83/25) (78/50)
5. On the whole, would you say that you like or dislike white persons? (like - 75/33) (like - 100/47)
6. Would you say that you are more or less prejudiced than your friends? (less - 42/25) (less - 70/38)
7. Do you think Negroes in your area are receiving their appropriate opportunities? (No - 100/50) (No - 86/47)

Group reactions were largely similar with some instances of divergence.

Item #1 relates to situations where there would be general face-to-face associations. Each group reports they are open to the activities but generally shy away when contact becomes closer. The community is regularly assessed as being much less open to the situations suggested.

Item #2 presents a series of statements from which the respondent is to select those, if any, approximating his viewpoint. Two, only, of these are essentially the same on each form. Negro responses see their community as much more open to civil rights demands; both recognize some individual resistance. The basic constitutional rights (2f) are asserted by 58% of Negro respondents and by but 25% of the white persons' replies. Both assess their communities as denying this basic equality. The most frequently (75%) chosen statement on Form A was 2e, which expressed resistance to being pushed into a position. Negro response favored (58%) the rather mild assertion of basic rights, 2f.

Item #3 gave a sample circumstance concerning Negro acceptance. The two forms differ in the illustration used. It seems important that all replies lean toward actions that are mild, non-public and basically personal. While such is true of their personal responses, it is even more evident in community comments. The most chosen actions are to "quietly leave," or "ignore the situation" or "express personal disapproval."

Item #4 lists a series of possible local conditions for reaction. The two forms attempt to express opposites. The contrast between individual and community related responses is marked. It is of

interest to note that the white responses are personally more open (av. 79%) to these changes but see the town as more resistan' (15%) than do Negro responses (23%) which average less in personal acceptance (73%). The directions of reaction rather than degree is significant.
Items #5, 6, and 7 are expressed in opposites. Negro answers indicate these respondents like white persons less, recognize prejudice more and feel they are not receiving equal opportunity in their localities. The white persons responding assert a personal liking for Negroes, insist on being less prejudiced and are divided on access to opportunities.

Considering the Inventory of Beliefs and the Attitude Survey, it appears that among the participants there is broad adaptation to the general culture in near the same degree. When civil rights situations are focused on, however, there is less unanimity but without sharp consistent contrast. It is desirable to emphasize the larger area of similarity in attitude rather than those areas of divergence. The differences are important, however, since they are evidence of a core of uncertainty and unacceptance with which the schools must deal.

The Human Relations Inventory, unlike the others, was used as a discussion base and a personal assessment instrument. Its purpose was to assist a school faculty in reviewing their attitudes and preferences, strengths and weaknesses. No review of group reactions was attempted. Seminar discussions explored possible uses which could be made of the material as a means for a total faculty survey and discussion.

It is asserted here that the participants had ample aids to help them see their position and thus they were able to indicate directions of shift in attitude. It is not believed, however, that quantitative evidences could be reliably obtained at this time. Later, during Phase III, there will be a more appropriate time for rechecking by re-use of one or more of the instruments employed.

The evaluations taken are consistent enough to assert that there were meaningful gains by all participants toward a greater capacity to become effective practitioners of desegregated education. Not all persons made comparable progress, as should be expected. The opportunity to experience an unpressured depth exploration of the real and imagined issues enabled the group to become much more open to continued integration. In addition to the common experience of all, slightly over one-half of the enrollees worked for college credit and in so doing reviewed a minimum of fifteen publications and prepared a special paper. As a whole these participants reported on projects or proposed projects which show real commitment to a personal program to enhance effective desegregated education.

The last aspect of evaluation consisted of the work done by the school faculties in programing a statement, School Status Analysis, on their school system. The school groups were asked to state (a) the plan for desegregation as of September, 1967, (b) possible ways to extend and/or make plans more effective, and (c) the local conditions to be considered and allowed for in (b). While completing these analyses the school groups were drawn deeply into the many aspects of their local school situations. Staff members consulting in the discussions were able to see a marked increase of understanding and pronounced expansion of interest in evolving positive and applicable procedures of integration. For some, the experience of working as a group on a plan was new and a knowledge of how to get themselves organized and effective became necessary.

It is judged that the school group portion of the Phase II program came to be a significant meaningful added experience. The preparation and presentation of the School Status Report forms a firm base for continued progress in Phase III. Condensed copies of the reports for El Dorado, Sparkman and Smackover are appended.

HOW FAR HAVE WE COME?

Evaluation by Mrs. Juanita Sandford - Staff Consultant

Those individuals who for several years have been engaged in Title IV desegregation institutes pause at the end of a session, an institute, a school year and a calendar year to ask both hopefully and optimistically "How far have we come?" This is a legitimate question for everyone wants to see the fruits of his labor. The person with a sensitive social conscience wishes to see mankind become man humane. A teacher earnestly desires to see all obstacles to the achievement of her pupils' learning removed. So we, parents, teachers, administrators, sociologists, psychologists, government officials ask from time to time "How far have we come" in successfully desegregating our schools, in solving problems incident to desegregation, in augmenting or enriching the education of all children in our society?

On May 17, 1954, the United States Supreme Court ruled that "in the field of public education the doctrine of separate but equal has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal."

The separate but equal principle was given legal sanction in the famous Plessy V. Ferguson case of 1896. At that time the United States Supreme Court sustained a Jim Crow statute in Louisiana which required separate railroad cars for Negroes and whites. This action by the Court was interpreted by man as the "go-ahead" signal for those who sought separate schools for the races. Therefore, for many years the philosophy "separate but equal" prevailed; and for many years the Negro has been handicapped in his attempt to acquire a quality education.

This has been extremely frustrating to Negro leaders who have realized that there are two keys which would open the locks on the doors which prohibit the Negro from advancing socially, educationally, economically and politically. The keys are the ballot and education.

During the pre-Civil War days it was, in some places in the South, against the law to teach a slave to read and write.

We have progressed to the point where we would not deny educational opportunities altogether to the Negro, but we did compromise our values when we permitted the Negroes' educational opportunities to be inferior and inadequate.

In 1944 when Gunner Myrdal published his American Dilemma, it became common knowledge that education furnished the Southern Negro was far below that afforded the whites. There were six major discrepancies.

1. There was less money spent per pupil for Negroes than for whites.
2. There was much difference in the value of school properties, Negro schools were worth far less than white schools.
3. Negroes had shorter school terms.
4. Less money was spent for transportation of Negro students.
5. The pupil-teacher ratio was less favorable in the Negro school.
6. Negro teachers were less well prepared and Negro teachers had lower salaries than white teachers.

The 1954 decision of the Supreme Court did not solve these problems. Those wishing to preserve segregation in the public schools have resorted to numerous tactics to circumvent the ruling. The freedom of choice plan is one of these in the opinion of many Southern Negroes.

While I was assigned to work with the Institute partipants from Sparkman, Arkansas, I learned that this small school system was typical of the school in the rural South. The freedom of choice plan was used there and accomplished very little in the way of integration. Faculty integration or desegregation was also on a small scale. The white high school librarian and the Negro librarian exchanged schools daily for one-half day. One other white teacher went to the Negro school to teach Spanish.

Negroes have been segregated for so many years and have experienced schooling so inferior that it has rendered them unsuitable to compete in American society. Educational segregation has for generations meant inferior training. Inferior training has meant unemployment or poor employment opportunities which in turn have meant lower incomes. Lower incomes have produced what we are calling today disadvantaged children. These children take to any school they attend learning problems, and they themselves as individuals or as a group may create or contribute to an already existing social problem in the school proper.

Two important statements need to emerge at this point. First, it should be emphasized that white children from the lower socio-economic class are also disadvantaged and many have learning problems; but fortunately for them, however, they have never been segregated because of skin color into inferior schools. Second, the "race problem" is basically a social class problem.

In attempting to assess how far we have come, I tried to see if the various phases of this Institute had imparted any knowledge on experience to the teachers that had helped them to solve problems which were directly related to the desegregation of the school. I found several problems had been solved and several remain to be solved in the future. At the last session our school group was asked to state how participation in the Institute had benefited them.

Many different responses came in answer to this question. One white social studies teacher indicated that she had during this year tried to teach a unit on the Negro in American History. She had never attempted this before in her many years of teaching and probably would not have done it this year if she had not received the suggestion and the motivation during Phase II. She reported that the white as well as the Negro students had enthusiastically viewed films about Negroes.

The librarian had ordered numerous books on Negro history and had observed students reading and discussing them. The list of books included: There Was Once a Slave, Races of Mankind, Black Boy, Black Like Me, Pictorial History of the Negro in the Civil War, Worth Fighting For (The Negro in the Civil War), Negro Medal of Honor Men, To Be Equal.

The students, upon completing several of the above named books, indicated that they were carrying them home for someone there to read. White children also chose some of these books on which to make their written reports.

The grade school teachers indicated that children in the lower grades act out stories during which a Negro girl or boy may play the role of mother or father to white girls and boys. The children seemed to be completely oblivious to the racial differentiation. This small illustration from the Sparkman grade school seems to substantiate a recent study made by Dr. Louis Diamant at the University of North Carolina. Briefly, the study revealed that no matter how prejudiced his parents may be, a white child may develop relatively free of racial prejudice if he attends an integrated school system at an early age.

The home economics teacher indicated that the clothing book which she uses in her classes tells ways of dressing for all racial groups; i.e. which skin color needs which colors of clothing to be attractively attired. Therefore, the book is adequate for girls of both racial groups. This same teacher sponsors F.H.A. and stated that the Negro girls came to the annual bunking party and were made to feel welcome. Also girls of both races and their mothers came to the mother-daughter banquet.

One significant finding reported by the teachers to the consultant is that integration seems to have improved discipline in the integrated setting. The Negro students who had talked back to the Negro librarian at the Negro school show her a great deal of respect in this same capacity at the white school. The consensus was that the discipline of the Negro students had improved.

Briefly, the teachers reported the following:

1. Seating alphabetically solved the problem of re-segregation in the desegregated classroom.
2. Negro and white teachers are now able to converse freely with one another.
3. Negro students who never talked freely without permission last year in the white school now speak freely and in a more relaxed manner.
4. Negro students now feel that they can ask white students to loan them books or paper.

We should be encouraged that seemingly a great deal of progress has been made at Sparkman, however, some serious problems remain.

White teachers mention difficulty in understanding Negro children because they pronounce certain words poorly, they use words unfamiliar to the teachers, they speak too softly.

Numerous Negro eighth grade students have had difficulty reading the required literature this year. An inquiry as to why this was a problem brought to light the fact that the Negro school had no seventh grade literature books last year; and consequently, these students had not studied seventh grade literature. With Title I funds text books had been purchased for the current school year. The foregoing substantiates the findings by Myrdal that in the past, less money has been spent per pupil for Negroes than for whites.

As to the value of school property it is obvious that the Negro grade school property is of less value than the white grade school. The building is inadequately heated and poorly equipped. This consultant found on visiting the school on the following day that the main hallway of the building was not heated. Each room was heated independently and opened into the hall. As children left warm heated rooms to change classes or to go to the lunchroom or restrooms, it was necessary for them to walk in an extremely cold hallway. These temperature extremes are factors conducive to sickness, and these children who already have low resistance caused by poor or improper nutrition should not be made to experience inadequately or improperly heated schools.

It was pointed out that the Negro students in the white high school still do not take part in the auditorium programs and extra-curricular activities such as the choir and play. It was suggested that perhaps greater care needs to be taken in the selecting and casting of plays in order to make it possible for the Negro students to participate.

In answer to my queries about discrepancies in the salaries of Negro and white teachers, I was told that the salaries in several teaching areas were unequal when the present superintendent was employed. The first year he had tried to do away with the inequities but soon learned that to bring the salaries of all the Negro teachers in line with those of the whites, he would have to lower the salaries of all teachers. Rather than lowering salaries, he preferred to abolish the inequities by a few each year. As of this report, only two Negro teachers' salaries remain below those of white teachers. These are the salaries of the home economics and the vocational-industrial teachers.

How far have we come? In November of 1967 a bond issue to build a new senior high school was defeated. Between November and March the faculty Institute participants and members of the community engaged in discussions concerned with the advantages to the whole community of a new high school. Some of the discussions were quite "heated". Prejudices were articulated in these confrontations. Feelings were injured, but people began to communicate and some measure of understanding was achieved by the two racial groups. In March the bond issue appeared on the ballot again. This time the community decided in favor of a new school.

We have come far enough to see that if school integration is going to proceed as peacefully and as rapidly as possible that there must be long range planning and cooperation on the part of school, church and community leaders. Lack of careful planning increases the possibility of problems and disorder.

School desegregation appears to be accelerating in the South. It should pick up a great deal of momentum in the very near future as the Supreme Court has ruled that freedom of choice is not acceptable and that a new device must be used to implement desegregation. A dual school system perpetuates the vicious cycle mentioned previously in this report - inferior education, lack of motivation, denia of employment together keep the Negro's productivity low and his income far below what is needed for a decent standard of living. We have come far enough to see that there is a paradox in all this; that economically and socially disadvantaged children need much better than average teachers, schools and equipment if they are even to approach the learning levels of advantaged middle-class children.

How far have we come? Several weeks ago this consultant was invited to speak to the student body of a small integrated rural community school. At the conclusion of the assembly program where I had spoken about anthropology and its attempt at understanding people of many races and cultures, I asked the superintendent why I had been extended this invitation. He replied by stating that three years ago he had been a participant in a desegregation institute. At that time he had learned some things which had completely altered his ideas about race. He had become more tolerant and open-minded and now had a desire to have the pupils in his school have the advantages to be afforded by exposure to the same information. This man, this teacher, had changed and he is past middle age.

In addition to feeling extremely gratified, I realized that we have come a long way. But in spite of my enthusiasm over our progress, I would be the first to say that we still have a long way to go.

Program Content Phase III

Phase III of the Institute sponsored cooperatively by Ouachita Baptist University and Henderson State College was designed as a follow-up and reinforcement of the preceding phases. It was organized so that there would be a series of common meetings of all participants, a larger number of school group meetings held in separate communities and staff consultation visits to each school.

The report following is in three parts: (a) the general meetings in El Dorado, (b) the school group sessions, and (c) evaluations. Total group sessions occurred on September 21, October 19, December 14, 1967. Dates of the school group meetings were: Sparkman - October 4, November 9, November 30, January 10, February 14 and March 27; the El Dorado and Smackover groups met one day later - October 5, November 10, etc.

General Sessions

The follow-up activities of the Institute had the first meeting on September 21, 1967, in El Dorado. Dr. Lawrence Davis, President, A.M. & N. College, Pine Bluff, Arkansas, was the keynote speaker for the session. The school groups met in discussions from 4:30 to 6:00 p.m. Supper period was 6:00-6:30, followed by the keynote presentation and discussion. The session closed with school group planning meetings to 9:30 p.m.

In his excellent presentation Dr. Davis emphasized a number of ideas which he encouraged the participants to apply and develop as they worked through the winter program. The following extracts from Dr. Davis' comments illustrate the emphases made.

> "We can no longer afford to leave the needs of the disadvantaged on the doorstep of the home."
>
> "Intelligence is learned through experience and the self-concept is the key to learning and intelligence."
>
> "Negro youth feel consciously and sub-consciously inferior as a result of our (teachers') educational leadership."
>
> "What kinds of rewards can be useful in the encouragement of learning?"
>
> "It is important that teaching focus upon ways to have students learn better."
>
> "Talent is universally present but there are many concepts of what constitutes talent."
>
> "Quality must be maintained but such is not necessarily the same thing as maintaining standards."
>
> "It is significant that McCrory, Arkansas, now has a single school system in which the school and public concern is for improved educational programs and not integration."

As in previous instances, Dr. Davis was well received and made a marked impact on the participants. This acceptance is again an illustration of the willingness of both white and Negro to follow the lead of excellence and ability. The keynote speech served to refocus the Institute on its purpose and to re-activate the participants in their tasks.

During the evening sessions each school faculty reviewed the general schedule. Local meeting plans were discussed and avenues of special needs or interests examined. The resources present within each school group were assessed in terms of the study plans.

General Meeting - October 19, 1967, El Dorado High School: The second total group follow-up session held on October 19, 1967, at the El Dorado, Arkansas, High School used the same format as the initial session. The schedule began at 4:00 p.m. and continued through 9:00 p.m.

Dr. Frost, co-author of The Disadvantaged Child, Issues and Innovations, presented the principle speech for the evening. His emphases included the following suggestions and concepts for discussion and development by the participants.

A. The present educational system has not yet incorporated adjustment to the needs present in the culture of the poor.
    1) Early deprivation and retardation may be easily reduced when attacked at early age, only slightly modified in cumulative effect when treatment comes at a late age (high school).
    2) New assumptions on learning, intelligence and need are necessary at all educational levels in order to avoid retarding the student in the school.

B. Directions of hopeful value include:
    1) an experimental attitude or frame of mind for teachers
    2) flexibility in teacher and pupil expectations
    3) carefully formed, precise behavioral goals and objectives
    4) language interaction encouragement with listening and speaking a real base for reading and writing
    5) encouragement of a perceptive insight and sensitivity among teachers who are sympathetic and aware of students interest and activity
    6) careful avoidance by teachers of the alienating actions which push students into devalued status.

At the conclusion of Dr. Frost's formal comments the group raised questions and made comments on items of concern and then dispersed to three small group discussions divided by teaching assignment level (primary, elementary, etc.). The final hour of the session focused in these groups where there was a general discussion developing out of Dr. Frost's presentation. Particular questions raised included:

1. How may teachers become more aware and perceptive? What does a person do in order to increase his sensitivity to student attitudes and actions?
2. Is there, in practice, any way to significantly aid the deprived student who has now been "passed along" to high school but still achieves at a low grade level?

El Dorado School Group - October 5, 1967: At this meeting of the Institute, we decided to try a different approach for the main session.

The approach was to present a panel consisting of five speakers. The title of the discussion was "Effective Teaching in the Desegregated School" based on a Phi Delta Kappa bulletin of the same title by James H. Bash.

The panel highlighted some of the problems which occasionally arise in the desegregated school and presented a variety of practical suggestions for dealing with them.

The general session was concluded with meetings of the different grade groups. Problems common to the participants were discussed.

El Dorado School Group - November 9, 1967: We began this meeting with the use of a four member panel discussion. The title of the discussion was "Classroom Grouping and Integration." The four main topics discussed were:

1. the community reflected in the school,
2. the purpose of instruction,
3. a climate for learning,
4. how and what children learn.

The Institute members engaged in discussion for and against the panel comments. However, we concluded that in a sense we are faced with two of the major controversial problems in education today - integration and the trend toward narrow-range grouping. The solutions to these problems are incompatible. That is, we cannot have integration (of any kind) and narrow-range grouping at the same time.

During the main session, Mrs. Mattie Crossley, consultant, involved our participants in a language arts discussion. She was well received and pointed out the value of being able to appreciate the positive aspect of the language of the children.

The group seemed to have felt that in an integrated situation the language barrier is often present.

Following the address, the question and answer session was dominated by questions and many possible solutions concerning the language situation.

It is the evaluator's opinion that the group had positive feelings about the language of their students. They thought, to the student, his language is an integral part of his culture--his very being--and an attack on it is much more than an attack on his conversation; it is an attack on his own worth. Small wonder he so often reacts with sullenness, resentment, defiance.

The session closed on this note.

General Meeting - El Dorado - December 14, 1967: The Institute participants assembled for this session in order to hear presentations by Dr. Root, Ouachita Baptist University, and Mr. Leroy Miles, Henderson State College. Each presentation was accompanied by general and school group discussions on the points raised.

Mr. Miles spoke on his work with Headstart training during the summers of 1966 and 1967 at Henderson State College. Emphasis was placed on four general areas:

1) the Headstart concept and its significance for the deprived child and learning;
2) Headstart achievement in helping teachers see the potential and need;
3) problems of the child and learning needs, in particular the disadvantaged child's learning preparedness;
4) the teacher's role in countering social alienation in the student.

It was asserted that the Headstart approach and potential was in many ways parallel to the learning needs of older students who also are disadvantaged.

Dr. Root spoke out of his experience working with "Upward Bound" programs at Ouachita Baptist University. Particular stress was made upon the following:

1) presence in our ideas that about 15% of the population is unable to learn;
2) the significance of a self-image which asserts "we can't fail if we don't try;"
3) among disadvantaged, pessimism is an early and well learned lesson and fantasy only is successful;
4) moving students out of their usual living area is a potent avenue to create new interest and encourage learning beginnings.

Both speakers indicated the reality of the problems a school system has with the standard approaches and routines which may be perceived by the students as only another reflection of a society in which they have no place. Questions raised by the group indicated some awareness of the problems but a general absence of avenues for solution. As one suggested, it seemed that present approaches were all focused upon needs which in fact avoided the real difficulties disadvantaged students shared.

Evaluation of Impact of Institute Experiences on El Dorado School Program and Participants

by Hugh Watson, Assistant Director

The Title IV Institute, which culminated in El Dorado, Arkansas on March 21, 1968, has made us more conscious of the damage wrought by segregation. We seem to have concluded that, on the one hand, it denies people a good opportunity for learning to live in a multiracial and multicultural world. On the other hand, it denies people the kind of mental health necessary to the fullest use of their talents. In both ways, everybody suffers, and opportunities for learning and progress are less than they might have been.

The integrated Institute itself was an initial attack on segregation; the races were exposed to each other. This may prove to be valuable. One could say that the best way to build good relations between the races is to enable each race to have experiences with the other which are welcome and fruitful and in which each race can come to see the other as composed of individuals and not stereotypes.

Use of racial epithets, consciously or unconsciously, is likely to provoke animosity. The Institute was instrumental in establishing this point of view. This may prevent the use of such terms as "nigger", "cracker", etc. We learned or were reinforced in the belief that Nigra, a mispronunciation of the term Negro, is offensive to Negroes.

The Institute brought an increased awareness of similar problems faced by educators of any race. One problem is that of reducing routine duties. Another is that of educators facing their own biases and setting them aside to do a better job of teaching their classes regardless of racial composition. There is the problem of finding a way to relate to parents of a different racial group. Still another is discarding preconceived ideas about children which have not been based on reliable educational literature and research.

The Institute has laid a foundation for increased cooperation of all school personnel in helping all children achieve maximally.

The Institute focused attention on the principal. He needs to play a definite role in establishing the acceptance of the teacher who is different racially from the majority of the staff. He needs to exercise good judgment in supervision so as to get best results from the teacher who is new to the school. Where necessary, he must act as liaison person between parents who are hesitant to accept a teacher of a different race.

The Institute seemingly has made clearer the role of the superintendent. The Institute provided the opportunity for the superintendent to bring about interaction between the races in a favorable climate. Since the superintendent was present at many of the sessions, he may have received reinforcement to his ideas for carrying out fairly the steps he is now taking toward school integration.

The evaluator is of the opinion that the Institute introduced many problems in school desegregation. These problems were broadly discussed by both national and local educators. However, our school system seems to be left with a need for planned follow-up activities or sessions, that will reinforce and extend the positive elements of Title IV Institute.

Evaluation of Institute by Participants

Institute participants from El Dorado were asked for written evaluations of all phases of the Institute. The following are significant comments extracted from those evaluations:

1. I think I can be more open-minded toward the opposite race. I no longer see social problems as peculiar Negro or Caucasian problems but as American problems that concern everyone.
2. The peculiar problems of both groups were well presented making for better understanding between races in attendance at the Institute.
3. During the workshop I have developed a greater appreciation for Negro teachers in our own school system.
4. I feel being in this group has helped me know more of the Negro teachers in our district than I could have ever known otherwise.
5. I think the white and Negro teachers understood each other for the first time.
6. The Title IV Institute has helped most of the participants understand and respect other cultures, beliefs, ideas, and bridge the gap between the races.
7. It has resulted in my being able to judge an individual as an individual and not as a member of a group.
8. The results from this contact can not be measured in dollars and cents. Anyone who came with an open mind never failed to get help on some problems.
9. We all had an opportunity to learn new knowledge about the race.
10. I've had an inner change in my thinking and ideas about teaching human beings.
11. Attending and participating in this workshop has been one of the most rewarding experiences I've encountered in my lifetime. In a sense, it has been a rebirth.
12. My attitudes have changed, and I feel that I better understand the problems of the Negro.
13. I think my work with the Title IV group has helped me to help my Negro co-worker fit in our faculty.
14. In this three phase program, introduction and historical background was adequate in its presentation and this tended to dispel many stereotyped concepts that many held about minority groups.
15. Best of all we have learned to openly discuss our problems and to iron out differences by such discussions.
16. I believe we are becoming "color blind."
17. I am both a better person and a better teacher because of my participation in the Title IV Institute.
18. I have been given a greater understanding of the children I teach from deprived homes or groups.
19. This course has helped me to understand children and their needs better.

On the basis of the written evaluations of the El Dorado participants and staff observations, the following summarizing statements can be made:

1. Most of the participants stated that they had received new knowledge and insight which has helped them to better understand people of other races and cultures.
2. The new information gained has made them express the feeling of willingness toteach in a desegregated school.
3. Most of the participants now feel better prepared to understand and to teach the disadvantaged child. Only one person replied that she "had neither the desire nor the courage to embark on the career of teaching the deprived child."
4. Most of the participants expressed the opinion that the consultants made outstanding contributions and that Phase II was unusually well planned.
5. Many of the participants motivated by the consultants' suggestions feel a need and a challenge to experiment with new or different methods of teaching in order to have more individualized instruction.
6. Several participants expressed the opinion that making friends of members of another racial group and working together for the solution of common problems was the chief value to be derived from the Institute.
7. The consensus was that there should be follow-up procedures that would involve the entire community and create the atmosphere for a realization of effective human relations.
8. The Title IV Desegregation Institute is a good approach and should be continued. Only two participants expressed the feeling that the Institute had accomplished little in their school system.
9. The lines of communication between the races opened during the Institute have continued into the local school situations where Institute participants are employed.

Smackover School Group Program, Phase III: Planning for the Phase III program meetings was carried on by letter, by conferences with the superintendent and by school group discussions during the total group sessions (September 21, October 19) as well as locally. It was decided to focus upon those local school developments in which the totally desegregated situation evidenced some special need. In particular it was intended to emphasize classroom learning demands which had come about or were accentuated by the completed integration.

Smackover Middle School Group Meeting - October 5, 1967: The Smackover school group had its initial local meeting on October 5, 1967. The schedule adopted began at 4:30 p.m. and ran to 9:30 p.m. Three topics were involved. One, to review the Phase II plans prepared; second, to assemble specific learning situations associated with integration in the classrooms; and thirdly, to begin a review of teaching and/or learning objectives as planned and carried out in the local school system with the intent to increase the effectiveness of their application

The Smackover school group plan (see Phase II) was re-examined. As the group discussed each proposed activity it became increasingly apparent that the anxieties present during the summer of 1967 were never realized. A program of public information was completed and had been useful. The remainder of the plans had not needed implementation. In short, the review demonstrated the workability and acceptibility of the initial total desegregation program under which the system began operations in the fall of 1967.

During the second period of the session, seminars were formed and asked to prepare lists of the school situations which had been observed and which were associated with the "new-mix" in desegregation. The seminars found they had great difficulty recording specific events but thought in terms of categories and generalized solutions. The purpose of the exercise was to separate the ready-made teacher solution from the particular condition to which it was addressed. By so doing it was hoped that some freshness could be added to the approaches available among the teaching skills present. In addition an initial listing of needs identified would be obtained.

The following items were listed:

Elementary group

a. Eleven students (35%) of a class are below reading level.
b. Classes too large for adequate individual attention
c. Inability to recognize numbers and letters
d. Excessive non-teaching routine
e. Lack of homework preparation

Secondary and middle school group

a. Incomplete communication between instructor and pupil
b. Frequent "name calling" by student
c. Frequent nervous giggling
d. Lack of understanding of assignments
e. Unable to enter into class discussions

As a beginning toward a clearer focus upon the learning needs evidenced the seminars were successful and it was planned to come back to the topic later.

The third emphasis of the session was to begin a study of teaching-learning objectives. The starting point was a review of the concepts presented by Robert Magers in his book Preparing Instructional Objectives. Essentially, Magers encourages the formulation of teaching objectives which focus upon the behavior observed as evidence of an achievement. Having examined the thesis presented by Magers the group was dismissed with the assignment of examining and recording some of their present teaching objectives. It was planned to compare and discuss these in later sessions.

Smackover High School-Group Session - November 9, 1967: Mrs. Mattie Crossley, Memphis Public Schools, visited in the system during the day and reviewed her primary comments during the initial part of the session. She encouraged the faculty to continue its program and complimented their attitudes and real interest in student achievement. Visits were made to each school and classes in English, American History, reading clinics, phonics, fourth and fifth grades. Mrs. Crossley especially urged the faculty to recognize the necessity of teaching reading at any class level where it was needed and to use ability and achievement groupings within classes in the high school as well as others.

The remainder of the session included two topics: a discussion of materials submitted by Mrs. Crossley and proposing a regular emphasis upon "Critical Reading," along with guidelines for improving spelling and English facility; secondly, a review of group progress on learning objectives.

Critical reading skills would provide training in reading for a purpose and meaning, in reading with a question in mind.

The framing of behavioristically oriented learning of objectives was discussed in order to share group progress. Generally there was evident reluctance, thus far, to discuss the actual objectives used and this was scheduled for later meeting.

Smackover School Group Meeting - November 30, 1967: The session emphasis was divided into two areas. The two initial hours placed emphasis upon a group review of the "critical reading" concept introduced by the consultant Mrs. Mattie Crossley followed by seminar discussions in which the faculty examined their school objectives in the math area. The latter topic also made preparation for Mr. Cecil McDermott's presentation planned for the 7-9:30 p.m. period.

Mr. Cecil McDermott, mathematics coordinator, State Department of Education, reviewed the work compiled by The Stanford University study group on mathematics and curricula for disadvantaged. In lecture and discussion Mr. McDermott, as he had for the El Dorado and Sparkman groups, related the procedures and general results of the study. The main aspects of the presentation were:

a. a review of the Tyler's steps in curriculum development. The problem of a highly structured subject being studied by a generally disorganized group was stressed.
b. an examination of the nature of the disadvantaged society as seen by the Stanford group.
c. a discussion on stability and change in human development which stressed the importance of the 4-8 age period.
d. a listing and explanation of goals and suggestions of a math program for the disadvantaged. Key concepts were (1) the emphasis upon growth of self-discipline and confidence and (2) teacher dedication to the goals as the most initial facet of teaching accomplishment.

Mr. McDermott was well received and lively discussion reflected the group's interest in the material reviewed.

Smackover School Group Session - January 28, 1968 - High School Library: The Smackover schools were not in session on this date so the meeting was adjusted to 1 p.m. to 6 p.m. The program consisted of a review of presentations made in El Dorado, December 14, 1967, seminar study formulating instructional objectives, study on the faculty team concept with an individual assessment of the local staff as a team. The team assessments were a repeat of a reaction instrument used in Phase I.

Seminars worked on preparing objectives through two avenues. One group tried to reform the school reading program objectives in behavioral terms. The secondary teachers were asked to state the objectives attainable from a specific experience of a film, "Australia."

Each seminar then presented their results to the entire session. Both seminars found it difficult to view their teaching task in terms of the behavioral outcomes for which they would strive. In each seminar there was recognition of the value, to students with weak backgrounds, of having clearly found behavioral goals. The seminars had greater success dealing with a specific task in forming learning objectives based on the film.

It is judged that the program purpose at this meeting, to move the school group toward the point of having successfully framed clear behaviorally oriented learning goals, was but partially achieved.

A final period discussion on planning the February meeting closed the meeting. A report on the "team assessment" was promised for the February meeting.

Smackover School Group Meeting - February 15, 1968: The initial part of the program was attended by the entire high school faculty as well as the Institute participants. Mrs. Juanita Sandford, Ouachita Baptist University, addressed the group on the topic of "Learning Objectives in the Social Sciences, How to Aid Students to Live in Tomorrow's World." In her address Mrs. Sandford emphasized the following: a basic aim is to achieve an ability to evaluate and work with new situations as they arise. One future situation that is pertinent seems to be the population explosion, which will change our relationships to people by making concentrations much greater. The needs of intergroup relations are bound to change as urbanism continues and our understanding of resource conservation will necessarily become more remote. Social institutions must be understood as evolving relationships in a state of continuous change rather than static structures. It is desirable to reassess our beliefs as to the nature and desirability of work and the nature of leisure. A pertinent question here is why we so often feel that leisure also must be productive. The base for social status is changing and will involve attitudes toward people less economically well off.

In speaking to the foregoing topic, Mrs. Sandford emphasized the following as suggestions in teaching: avoid being dogmatic; play down the idea of "fast learning"; involve the child in the current scene; encourage an awareness of value systems in other cultures, particularly as they relate to group versus individual status; and finally, encourage awareness of our own changing values and attitudes.

Mrs. Sandford concluded by re-emphasizing the importance of young people becoming adept at living in a changing world whose problems may not even be known while they are in school.

The next portion of the program consisted of a brief report on the Smackover school group ratings of their faculty relations. These are reported in the team assessment reports in the evaluation section.

The final part of the session consisted of a panel discussion together with group discussion on the general topic of Smackover teacher experience compared to the literature on problems of desegregation. During the presentation the following comments appeared significant. It was asserted that high school students would not develop effective student-made standards of conduct. This was contrary to beliefs presented by writers in the field. The panel concurred in the belief that ordinary textbook work was usually of little interest to students. The panel and the group believed that they had seen evidence to the effect that disadvantaged students frequently feel that nobody cares what or how well they do. Therefore patience, insight, uniform fairness, frequent individual recognition are all needed in the desegregated school teaching task. The entire group concurred in the assertion that extra reading aid was needed, was being used in the Smackover school, but was still in short supply. The importance of the self image was recognized, but the participants and the panel believed they needed more time and aid in order to effectively deal with the problem.

In contrast to the school systems generally, it was believed that few integration problems were present in the elementary school. This was not to assert there were no difficulties in learning.

During the discussion it became apparent that the school group believed the literature they had been able to read about school desegregation needs was helpful but that the frequency of direct relationship between experience and the literature was much less than they had anticipated. Writings in the area leave the teacher with an expectancy of frequent grave student difficulties, whereas in-class experience seems to indicate infrequent serious interruption but persistent minor shortcomings related to students with disadvantaged backgrounds.

Smackover School Group Meeting - March 28, 1968: The general purpose of the session was to provide opportunity for review, oral evaluation comments, and reaction questionnaires and to hear a presentation by Mr. Jessie Mason, Farm Home Administration, Little Rock.

The results of the evaluation and reaction report are included in the section on evaluation.

Mr. Jessie Mason was asked to make his presentation because of his long-time experience working with Negro families in the state of Arkansas. Mr. Mason has been a primary organizer for the Farmer's Home Administration in their work in the state. His discussion was to form a base from which the participants could more effectively establish contact with the local Negro community beyond their school requirements.

In his talk and the accompanying slides, Mr. Mason reviewed the activities of his organization and its problems working in the state. He focused his comments around what he called "the poverty box in eastern Arkansas." The following ten points were emphasized:

1. low educational levels with a strong need for adult education
2. a lack of training beyond the immediate farm and home experience.
3. frequent absence of effective skills.
4. little management ability and no background for management.
5. few resources available, no land, no house, etc.
6. no credit, families with twelve children, two rooms, in a foot log community.
7. handicapped persons without aid and with no communication to obtain help.
8. old age.
9. poor health from poor water, poor diet, poor housing, no medical assistance.
10. lack of agility, ability, motivation, with a need for interest and aid by others.

As he presented these conditions, Mr. Mason pointed to the Farmer's Home Administration program features operating to alleviate some part of these failings. It is believed that the discussion presented and the questions raised were effective in increasing the awareness of the group toward Negro community conditions and the consequent educational handicaps associated with children from this community.

Evaluation of Impact of Institute Experiences on Smackover School Participants and School Program

The meetings in Smackover were located in each of the parts of the school system and occurred during October through March. There were six meetings in all.

The sessions were devoted to topics which the group found of potential value to their ongoing operation. The Smackover School District became totally integrated with the beginning of the 1967 school year. The school organization was modified to include a primary-elementary school, a middle school, and a high school. Negro students attended at their appropriate grade level in the system. No other separation or assignment was involved. The faculty also was integrated with three Negro teachers, those who chose to remain, in the system as school began in September 1967. One of these three resigned, because of his general health, in November 1967.

It was apparent at the Institute Staff worked with the Smackover group that this faculty was most concerned about having an effective educational program in view of the "new mix" among the students. As the school was visited during the Institute period it was possible to see and hear concern on the part of the teachers for the new problem they were experiencing. In essence the faculty had become much more sensitive to the educationally and culturally disadvantaged students who were present in a larger proportion than the teachers had previously known. Questions arising during discussion frequently brought up points of need in dealing with students who lacked some part of the skills needed for a given grade level. Generally, the primary grades experienced less difficulty than did the teachers at the middle school and high school levels. However, all participants, as well as other faculty, reflected a willingness to work with the situation and in so doing to adopt any procedure which offered possible gain. The high school faculty became interested in and began to work with special reading aids and in class ability level grouping. Participants reported and were observed in dealing openly and directly with questions involving race-culture contrasts among the students. On the basis of staff observations and visits as well as the faculty work, it is believed that the Smackover school group made significant progress in its ability to deal with an integrated school system and the attendant problems using the abilities and resources available to them within the community. There was a willingness to procede on their own to deal with difficulties immediately present in the school. For example, the honor's day awards were structured so that no student could receive more than one award and three Negroes received distinct honors. One Negro girl was elected to the Honor Society and one to Girl's State; and a young man was recognized for one of the popularity awards.

Observations of faculty during their teaching duties showed them aware of the need to work with students on the basis of their educational need and to handle a class without emphasis upon the racial mixture present. Questions discussed on educational practice involved learning situations rather than racial situations. The faculty members were observed to be using special care in their own speech in order to encourage student improvement. Disciplinary problems were not distracting. The Negro staff members were able to effectively discipline, when necessary both white and Negro students. It is not asserted that the school year in Smackover operated without some tensions between white and Negro students but it is maintained that the Institute made an important contribution to faculty ability to see the individual issues present rather than lumping them into stereotyped racial categories.

When responding to requests to evaluate the impact of Phase III, the faculty indicated that meetings coming at the end of a school day and spread over several months were difficult to work with and that frequently they came too tired to become much involved. No faculty report, however, indicated that they had made no progress during Phase III. The faculty believed that the presentation of different concepts and possible approaches was of value to them and that maintaining some emphasis upon the beginnings made in Phase II was valuable.

The mere presence in their system of outsiders who could observe and comment was the most frequently mentioned valuable experience. The participants expressed a wish that such visits could be continued in the future.

When asked to state what they believed to be the best possible use of additional financial aid, two items dominated the responses. First, a need was expressed for Headstart activities and second, a need was expressed to assist disadvantaged students both in school and at home. It is concluded that these suggestions indicate an expanded sensitivity on the part of the faculty.

When the participants made response on the team analysis form, they rated their faculty slightly higher in January than it had been rated in the previous May. The range of ratings, however, remained essentially the same. It would appear that during the year and in part because of the Institute activities the participants became more aware of the possibilities open to a faculty which was working effectively together.

When the participants responded to the reaction attitude survey instruments their responses in March 1968 were very much the same as their responses in June 1967. On both occasions the faculty assessed themselves as being decidedly more open to Negro associations and needs than was the community in general. Furthermore, the group again assessed itself as being less prejudiced than others in the community. It appears from these responses that there was little change in general attitudes to the racial situation during Phase III and that such changes occurred during the Phase II activity.

When the participants repeated taking the Inventory of Beliefs the scores of the group show a slight increase indicating the possibility of some increased openness to change and decrease in rigidity of attitude. It is not clear that this change is a significant one. The highest and lowest scores were the same but the average increased.

C. M. Strack, Associate Director, was the staff member working with the Smackover School group during Phase III. In total he assesses the Institute impact as having accomplished these things. (a) The participants had opportunity to prepare themselves for the new experience of a fully integrated school system. (b) There was opportunity to lay plans for action to make the integration operate smoothly. (c) Individuals became capable of working with both white and Negro students without uncertainty and often with compassion for the Negro's fears of the situation. (d) Individual participants became more conscious of their own attitudes and were able to adjust them to the professional demands. (e) The participant group became more conscious of the contrasts within the school district and of the difference in learning needs among the disadvantaged student and those with greater background. (f) The participants were much more open to modifying and adjusting their teaching procedures in order to meet the new demands. (g) The faculty and the participants became increasingly effective in working out procedures needed in the school without relying on "outside advice."

Not all parts of the Institute were equally effective. The summer Phase II had the greatest impact. Phase III was important in extending the beginnings made in Phase II and associating the demands of desegregation to the day-to-day needs of public education.

Summary of Meetings with Sparkman School Group

October 2, 1967, Sparkman High School, Mrs. Herman Sandford: The discussion at this particular session centered around two questions: How do you motivate the disadvantaged child? and How do you interest some children, frequently the disadvantaged, in reading? Mrs. Sandford, who was in charge of the session, made several suggestions to the participants.

In regard to motivation we heard that:

1. The teacher may be more successful in motivating students if she possesses and transmits personal warmth.
2. Disadvantaged children seem to respond more directly to audio-visual teaching such as films and records may provide.
3. These children seem most interested in literature that emphasizes human relations and human rights.
4. The material which the teacher is trying to get across should be related to the reality of the student's life.
5. A child may not be able to generalize until he has done something physical with the concept he is attempting to grasp.

In order to motivate these children to read it was suggested that we:

1. Let them read books with fast moving plots.
2. Arrange books by topics instead of using the Dewey Decimal System.
3. Give reading awards in the form of books or periodicals.
4. Use the students as helpers in the library.
5. Have a paperback bookstore in the school and sell the books at prices cheaper than newsstand prices. Students can begin to build their own libraries.
6. Use Title I and Title III money to implement the reading program of the school. Buy books about all racial groups and cultures.

November 7, 1967, Sparkman Training School; Guest Consultant - Mrs. Mattie Crossley: Mrs. Crossley addressed the Sparkman School group during the pre-dinner session on the subject "Problems of Communication." Her talk was well illustrated with transparencies. Mrs. Crossley pointed out that teachers have a five-faceted problem:

1. Motivating a desire to master the acceptable social language.
2. Providing instruction that will help the children to master the socially acceptable language.
3. Encouraging and insisting that the children use the socially acceptable language in their speech and in their written work.
4. Granting approval in the form of grades or praise to those children who do master and use the socially acceptable language.
5. Showing disapproval in the form of grades or criticism to those who do not master the socially acceptable language.

Following the dinner hour the participants engaged in a discussion led by the guest consultant. Subjects touched on during the discussion included: poor spelling - contributing causes and corrective measures; techniques involved in critical thinking - building critical thinking skills in reading; deductive and inductive reasoning. Mrs. Crossley was well received by the group.

November 29, 1967, Sparkman High School, Guest Consultant, Dr. Cecil McDermott: Dr. McDermott spoke to the participants on the subject "Teaching Mathematics to the Disadvantaged Child." He first pointed out that the disadvantaged child enters school qualitatively less well prepared than the child from the middle or upper socio-economic classes. The disadvantaged child, having entered the school with a minimum of pre-educational experiences must be given more opportunity to acquire understanding of such concepts as "average," "comparison," "larger," and "smaller" which other children acquired in their preschool years. Since these children have not learned the above concepts which are acquired in the everyday experiences with parents and middle class society in general, the first experiences which they must have in school will be ones which will fill the gaps in their development.

January 10, 1968, Sparkman Training School, Dr. Waldo Dahlstedt: Using a series of three filmstrips, Dr. Dahlstedt spoke to the participants on testing and evaluating the work of the students in the Sparkman School system. He pointed out the advantage of using a uniform system of grading throughout the school and suggested that there are decided disadvantages in scoring tests on a percentage basis.

Mr. Skaife and Dr. Brown from the U. S. Office of Education and Dr. Wetherington, Director of the Institute visited the Sparkman group during the post-dinner session.

February 22, 1968, Sparkman Training School, Guest Consultant, Mrs. Joyce Springer: On this occasion Mrs. Springer spoke to the Sparkman School group on the subject "Four Recognizable Developments in Race Relations." The four developments discussed in detail by the speaker are as follows:

1. Legal remedies now exist to handle discriminatory practices against Negroes.
2. During the last twenty years all branches of government have become involved in the making of civil rights.
3. New frontiers of aspiration have been created for the Negro. In discussing this point, the speaker pointed out that while gains have come to the middle class Negro the gap between the middle class Negro and the Negro of lower socio-economic class is wider than it was formerly.
4. The emergence of the Black Power movement.

March 26, 1968, Sparkman School Program, Panel of American Women: The Panel of American Women presented the final program for the Sparkman participants and interested persons in the community. The Panel is unsponsored and is composed of women who represent different racial and ethnic groups as well as the three major religious faiths of the United States: Catholic, Protestant and Jewish. These women give their time in order to go before school, church or civic groups and present their program with the intent of helping to reduce or alleviate racial and ethnic prejudice, ignorance and ill-will.

Each member of the Panel presented a short biographical sketch about herself and her family in which she told about the experiences which motivated her to become a member of the Panel. Following the Panel's presentation, the moderator directed questions from the audience to members of the Panel. On this occasion the Panel also asked questions of the participants relative to the work of the Institute.

On this particular evening the Panel was composed of:

Mrs. Barbara Phillips, white, Jewish
Mrs. Janet Beck, white,Catholic
Mrs. Mildred Terry, Negro,Protestant
Mrs. Jean Gordon, white, Protestant
Mrs. Brownie Ledbetter served as moderator for the Panel.

The consensus was that the presentation was invaluable. The participants regretted the fact that the white community failed to attend and consequently could not be helped and inspired by the dialogue which took place.

APPENDIX

SCORE TABULATION

INVENTORY OF BELIEFS

Score Groups	White Responses	Negro Responses	Total
110+	0	1	1
105-109	1	1	2
100-104	2	0	2
95-99	1	0	1
90-94	1	0	1
85-89	4	4	8
80-84	6	3	9
75-79	4	2	6
70-74	2	3	5
65-69	7	1	8
60-64	2	1	3
55-59	1	3	4
50-54	1	2	3
45-49	3	2	5
40-44	2	0	2
35-39	1	1	2
30-34	1	1	2
25-29	0	1	1
20-24	0	0	0
N	39	26	65
Mean	70	66	68

WHAT MAKES A GOOD TEAM?

The variables or "requirements" are defined in terms of ideal conditions as they apply to each member.

1. Mutual Trust

   I can state my views and differences openly without fear of ridicule or retaliation and permit others to do the same. No one on the team will "cut the other's throat."

2. Mutual Support

   I can get help from others on the team and give help to them without being concerned about prerogatives. I don't have to protect my function against them nor do they need to protect theirs against me.

3. Communications

   I don't have to be guarded and cautious about my communication. Because of mutual trust and support, I can say what I feel and how I am reacting.

4. Team Objectives

   No objective will be assumed by the team until it is clearly understood by all members.
   No objective will be assumed by the team until we've worked our way through our differences and can honestly say we're committed to achieving the objective.

5. Conflict Resolution

   We accept conflicts as necessary and desirable. We don't suppress th nor pretend they don't exist; we work them through, openly, as a team.

6. Utilization of Member Resources

   My individual abilities, knowledge and experience are fully utilized by the team and I use those of other members. We accept and give advice, counsel, and support to each other while recognizing individual accountability and specialization.

7. Control Methods

   I accept the responsibility for keeping discussions relevant and for the integrity of the team operation; each other member accepts the same responsibility. We don't need a chairman or other devices to control us.

8. Organizational Environment

   We respect individual differences. We don't push each other to conform to central ideas or ways of thinking. We work hard at keeping our "team climate" free, open and supportive of each other.

ANALYZING TEAM EFFECTIVENESS

Analyze your team (the faculty with whom you work) by rating it on a scale from 1 to 7 (7 being what you would consider to be ideal) with respect to each of these variables:

My Rating

1. DEGREE OF MUTUAL TRUST

High Suspicion (1)____________________(7) High Trust __________

2. DEGREE OF MUTUAL SUPPORT

Every Man for Himself (1)____________(7) Genuine Concern for Each Other __________

3. COMMUNICATIONS

a. Guarded, Cautious (1)_____________(7) Open, Authentic __________

b. We Don't Listen to Each Other (1)____________(7) We Understand & Are Understood; We Listen __________

4. TEAM OBJECTIVES

a. Not Understood by Team (1)________(7) Clearly Understood by Team __________

b. Team is Negative Toward Objectives (1)_______(7) Team is Committed to Objectives __________

5. HANDLING CONFLICTS WITHIN TEAM

We Deny, Avoid or Suppress Conflicts (1) (7)"Work them through" We Accept Conflicts and __________

6. UTILIZATION OF MEMBER RESOURCES

Our Abilities, Knowledge & Experience Aren't Utilized by the Team (1)__________(7) Our Abilities, Knowledge & Experience Are Fully Utilized by the Team __________

7. CONTROL METHODS

Control is Imposed on Us (1)_________(7) We Control Ourselves __________

8. ORGANIZATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Restrictive; Pressure Toward Conformity (1)_______________(7) Free, Supportive; Respect for Individual Differences __________

TOTAL __________

AVERAGE
T/10 __________

GENERAL EVALUATION COMMENTS

Assessment of the Institute impact is inevitably complicated by the events of the year. These observations seem warranted. During the year each school district experienced decided changes from the preceding year. Institute participants played important roles in maintaining educational emphasis in Sparkman while striving to plan for a new building bond issue which would permit consolidating all school units on one site, in retaining continuity of effort during first-year fully integrated Smackover School system, and minimizing disturbance to the learning process while El Dorado experienced civil tension. In short, Institute participation provided a base in stability for the changes which occurred.

Two evaluation instruments were used to assemble reactions from all participants. One, Analyzing Team Effectiveness was completed during Phases I, II and III. No great change developed in group assessment, however, a shift from 4.6 to 5.2 occurred (possible variation 1-7). The direction of the shift was toward increased effectiveness.

The second instrument, an attitude survey, was used in Phases II and III. Responses are noted (pp. 33-35) for each use, and initial and second uses are compared in the following. Participants (white) shifted reactions in these ways. Responses in area (1) personal associations were erratic with small changes and with the most accepted integration situations remaining the same. The judgments of community acceptance made significant shifts. The participants came to assess the community as being more open to integrated associations. Highest acceptances attributed to the town were in the same features as the highest personal preference. It is noted that *Institute emphasis has made apparent to white participants that there is more public acceptance than was recognized initially*. Teachers do not operate alone in their efforts.

Responses changed irregularly (part 2) in preferred statements describing the general integration scene. The greater variety of individual reaction suggests that *the white participants recognize more complexity in the situation than before and "pat answers" are fewer, stereotypes decline*. The relatively safe "I don't like to be pushed" remains the preferred personal item and is attributed much more strongly to the community.

In respect to a specified integration situation (part 3) preferences for the quiet withdrawal or "*make no trouble*" responses became less but remained the most frequently chosen for both the individual and the town. *An enlarged willingness to openly encourage integration in public is expressed*.

Section 4 of the reaction sheet listed several integrated situations. Personal reactions were initially high in approval and remained so while judgment of the town evidenced that *the participants now feel it to be more open* to desegregation than earlier. The greater awareness of general support is again reflected in the changed response.

The final parts of the reaction items retained the initial pattern with two variations. One, there is an important decrease in feeling that Negroes are receiving appropriate opportunity. Two, the community is now judged as being more willing to accept, to like, Negroes than before.

The white participants have evidently become more effectively pointed in the direction of acceptance, action and town support for expanded desegregation.

The alternate (Form B) instrument reflected the following changes when earlier and later uses are compared. In part one, personal associations, individual reactions show increased openness to recreational integration and a small decline in willingness to work in integrated professional situations where Negroes are in isolated relationships. Assessments of community attitudes also show erratic change and, in total, indicate that this group sees their community as less favorable to personal integrated contacts. A clearly more varied reaction is evident in the second response showing that the Negro participants, too, are less stereotyped in their view of desegregation.

In judging the general situation (part 2) individual reactions are more varied and suggest much less uniformity of attitude. Whites are less often seen as believing that Negroes are pushing in where not wanted. An increased feeling is shown that the Negro demands should have been achievable through the normal social processes. On the same item, however, the town is much less frequently judged in this light. Negro participants evidence decidedly less unity in their assessment of the general situation on both occasions, reactions are more individual, less standardized.

Part 3 asks for a reaction to a specific desegregation occurrence. Individual responses show little change during the Institute period and emphasize the quiet and less aggressive actions. Their community is also judged as having the same kind of preferences. These participants do not wish to be the instigators of pressure incidents in desegregation.

Section 4 asked for reactions to integrated conditions in their community. There was a general increase of approval by individuals and in the judgment of town attitudes of approval. Negro participants now feel the communities to be more open to integration than they were initially.

In the last items there was a marked increase in responses indicating they like whites generally and feel less prejudiced. Both personal and community assessments agree. There was a decrease in agreement on whether Negroes are receiving their appropriate opportunities. There was an apparent reassessment of attitude during the Institute period.

In summary this comment is made: both Negro and white persons participating in the Institute had occasion to see aspects of desegregation not apparent to them initially and, in consequence, are more aware of the variety in conditions and of the greater depth of interest and support outside of their immediate associates.

There is evidence of Institute-associated change favorable to integration and to effective education.